E 1035

THE
REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

1903

VOLUME II.

EDITED BY

M. MUHAMMAD ALI, M.A.,

QADIAN,

DISTRICT GURDASPUR, PUNJAB, INDIA.

Annual Subscription... Rs. 4. | Single Copy As. 6.

*A Prophecy with regard to the End of the Cases.**

BY THE PROMISED MESSIAH.

On Monday night, *i.e.*, the night between 28th and 29th June 1903, a heavenly magnetism took possession of my ideas, and my attention was drawn to the question: 'What will be the end of the criminal cases instituted by Maulwi Karm Din of Bhin (Jhelum district), against me or those instituted by some of my followers against the said Karm Din?' Under the influence of this magnetism my condition was changed to one in which the Divine revelation is granted, and the Word of God came to me: ان اللہ مع الذین اتقوا والذین ھم محسنون فیہ آیات للسائلین The following interpretation of these words was also infused into my mind: "Of the two parties to these cases, Almighty God will be with those, and will grant assistance and victory to them, who are righteous, do not tell lies, are not unjust, do not bring forward false charges, do not unjustly oppress others by deception, fraud and dishonesty and shun every evil, and who, on account of the fear of God, are true sympathisers and well-wishers of their fellow-beings and do good to them, and who are not led by their passions to bestiality, iniquity and evil, but who are ever ready to do good to every one. These are the people to whom the decisions of these cases will be favourable. Then will not only one sign but many signs appear for those who inquire as to the party which is in the right," and peace be on those who follow truth and guidance.

QADIAN:
29th June, 1903.

*This subject appeared in the number for July, 1903 (Vol. II, No. 7), in the same place in which it is now inserted.

CONTENTS.

Page.

The Transformation wrought by the Holy Prophet ... 1

Jesus among the Ten Lost Israelite Tribes in the East, 8, 51, 181, 220, 393

(i.) Evidence from the Gospels, ... 8, 51, 181

(ii.) Evidence from the Holy Quran and Traditions 220

(iii.) Evidence from Medical Works 393

A Proposal for the Utter Extinction of Jehad 20

The Discovery of the Chola of Nanak 29

The Epiphany 37

The Banner of Islam 39

The Spiritual death of Christianity 40

Progress of the Ahmadiya Sect 41

Revelations 42

An Argument for the Truth of the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet 43

The early Life and Mission of the Promised Messiah ... 61

Istighfar 67

The Punjab Census Report... 82

Revelations of the Promised Messiah 82

Religious Conversion 85

Answer to an Objection 89

To what Extent is Research necessary for a Change of Religion 92

The Three Principles of religious Conversion 94

The Teachings of Christianity, Arya Samaj and Islam in relation to God 97

(i.) Christian Teachings in relation to God 97

(ii.) Arya Samajic Teachings in relation to God 102

(iii.) Muslim Teachings in relation to God 121

The Teachings of Christianity, Arya Samaj and Islam in relation to the Social and Moral Conduct of Man ... 135

Which of the Three Religions (Christianity, Arya Samaj and Islam) guides men to the living God. 144

Answer to Objections of the Arya Samaj against Islam ... 148

Payee.

(*i.*) Arsh 149
(*ii.*) Creation 153
(*iii.*) Change of Law... 153
(*iv.*) Intercession 154
Sanatan Dharm 155
A Vision 158
The Need of the Holy Quran... 159
Custom and Tradition 172
Certainty in Faith 176
The five Daily Prayers 179
The Higher Criticism and the Church Missionaries 193
Ruhulla 195
Increase of Muhammadans in India in the last Decade ... 196
The Tomb of Jesus at Srinagar 197, 336, 457
The Sources of Divine Knowledge 205
Controversy on the Sinlessness of the Prophets 226
(*i.*) A remarkable Feature of the Controversy 228
(*ii.*) Christian Ignorance of Arabic exposed 229
(*iii.*) Zanb used in the sense of Human Weakness 234
(*iv.*) Is Jesus Sinless according to the Holy Quran 241
(*v.*) Is not the word 'Jurm' used of the Jews 242
(*vi.*) Traditions on the Question of Sinlessness 245
(*vii.*) Does the Quran relate the Sins of the Prophets 246
Dr. Lefroy on "the Moral Tone of India" 247
Monro on "Sinlessness" 249, 289, 351, 467
(*i.*) Adam's eating of the Forbidden Fruit ... 251
(*ii.*) The Charge of Shirk against Adam ... 252
(*iii.*) Noah's Prayer 259
(*iv.*) Jonah's Flight 264
(*v.*) Moses' Killing a Man 271
(*vi.*) Charge of Idolatry against Aaron ... 277
(*vii.*) Charge against Abraham 278
(*viii.*) Charge against David 289
(*ix.*) Charges against the Holy Prophet ... 297
(*x.*) Communication from Mr. Monro ... 351
(*xi.*) Reply to above 352

Pages.

(*xii.*) Quranic verses proving General Sinlessness of the Prophets 469

Are all Religions from God 281

A Prophecy with regard to the end of certain Cases. (For detail, see inside of cover) 288

The Epiphany on the Muslim doctrine of hell 320

A Review of Christianity from a new Point of View 325

(*i.*) Trinity 325

(*ii.*) Jesus did not die upon the Cross ... 328

(*iii.*) The Tomb of Jesus at Srinagar ... 336

Will Dowie fight this Duel 343

That Prophet 358

The Second Advent of the Messiah 363, 405

An Appeal to the Universities or Christianity in a strait ... 381

The Fall of Christianity 390

Mr. McCuskey in the Union Signal 400

The Story of the Two Martyrs 405

(*i.*) The Martyrdom of M. Abdul Rahman 438

(*ii.*) The Martyrdom of Maulvi Abdul Latif 439

(*iii.*) Prophecies relating to the Safety of the Promised Messiah and the Two Martyrdoms 447

(*iv.*) A few words of Advice to my Followers 452

The English Press on the Promised Messiah 477

C.-*Contd.*

Pages.

Christian religion, a sad picture of, 384
Christianity, see Jesus, Bible. Spiritual death of, 40. Fall of, 390.
Church Family newspaper (extract from), 479
Church Missionary Society 18
Clarke, Henry Martyn 18, 28
Commentaries of Quran, value of, 250
Conference, the great Religions, 205
Corfe, Mr. Appeal of, to the universities, 381
Creation, objection against, considered, 153
Crucifixion, duration of, 52. Instances of lives saved after, 183.
Crucifragium, 53, 183
Curse, signification of, 12. Attribution to Jesus of, 12. Jesus not subjected to, 163.
Custom, value of (Sunnat), 172

D.

David, refutation of charges against, 289
Dayanand, Pundit, 117, 139, 141, 155, see Sonl. Followers of, 456. Faith founded by, cannot prosper 457.
Deutronomy 18, 18-22, 358
Divine injunctions, a universal law with regard to, 415
Divine love, punishment of the wicked, a manifestation of, 220
Divorce, 143, 144
Douglas, Cap. W., 28
Dowie, Dr., 343, 345, 474. 476, 477
Drunkenness, 135

E.

Earth, a symbol of a Divine attribute, 125
Elijah, second advent of, 175, 371, 375, 418
Encyclopaedia Biblica, 194, 383, 478
Epiphany, the, 37, 195, 197, 226, 320, 358, 458

F.

Fatiha, See Muhammadan prayer.
Fisq, see Zanb.
Five credible passages in the Gospels, see Gospels.

G.

German critics, old rationalistic school of, 334
Glasgow Herald (extract from), 478
God, the Arya Samajist conception of, 102, 130 Christian conception of, 97. Muslim conception of, 121. Sustenance afforded by, is of 4 kinds, 124. The 4 Hindoo Deities are manifestations of the four attributes of, 125

G.

Pages.

Golgotha, see Srinagar.
Gospels, force of the narrative of, 9. Teaching of, 138; its defects, 138. Plagiarism in, 167. Supposed uniform tenor of, 181. Only five credible passages in, 194, 478. Miracles of, 479
Gospel of the Hebrews, 391
Gospel of Nicodemus, 332
Gospel of Peter, 391
Gospel of Yus Asaf, see Bushra.
Griswold, Dr., the pamphlet of, 400
Gulab Shah, prophecy of, with respect to the advent of the Promised Messiah, 433.

H.

Halal, Al- 203, 340, 460
Harvest Field, 193, 386
Hell, not a place for the righteous, 321. Different names of, 322
Hewitt, Rev. J. F., 385
Higher Criticism, 193
Hindoo, see Arya Samaj, Sanatan Dharm.
Hindoo deities, see God.

I.

Id, 148
Idols, 160. In Arabia, 151
Idol-worship, the religion of India, 120, 155
Ikmal-ud-din, 339 461
Ilham, true signification of, 210
Insan, signification of the word, 106
Inspiration, Divine, granted to the faithful, 209. Way to, 214
Intercession, objection to, considered, 154
Ism, see Zanb.
Israel, lost sleep of the house of, 13
Israelite, the ten lost tribes, 8; converted to Islam. 223
Istighfar 37, 237. Root of, 67. Primary signification of, 68, 70, 72. Requirement of the creation of man, 69. Secondary meaning of, 71. Highest accomplishment of good men, 76. In paradise, 79. By Jesus 81
Istiqamat, 5

J.

Jalal-ud-din Sayooti, 300, 318
Jehad, See Muslim wars. Entinctive of, 20. Proposed book for the refutation of, 21, 27. Combated by the Promised Messiah, 84
Jesus, among the ten lost Israelite tribes, 8, 221, 393. Star at the birth of, 14.

J.-*Contd.*

Prayer of, 17, 182, 264, 330. In the disguise of a gardner, 55. Interview with the apostles, 56. Journey to Galilee, 57. First sepulchre of, 58. Duration of the crucifixion of, 52. Crucifragium not resorted to in the case of, 53. A five-sided God, 97. Miracle of casting out devils, 99. Supernaturalness in the birth of, no proof of divinity, 100. Prophecies of, 101. Failure of, 166. Flow of blood from the wounds of, 183. Value of the post-crucifixion, appearance of, 185. Gradualness in the recovery of, 186. Rising of the dead saints after the crucifixion, 187; true interpretation of, 190. Return of, 190. Second advent of, two sort of prophecies relating to, 192. Fulfilment of both, 192. "A soul from God," the true interpretation of, 195. Tomb of, 197, 336, 457. Did not die upon the cross according to the Quran, 221. Clearance of charges against, 223. Christians went astray after the death of, 224. Hint in the Quran to the journey of, to Cashmere, 224. Age of, according to traditions, 225. Traditions relating to the flight of, 226. Silence of Christians to defend, 228, 357. Sinlessness of, according to Quran, 241. Plucking of forbidden corns on a forbidden day attributed to, 259. Hides himself, 270. Lies attributed to, in Gospels, 280. A story told of, 297. Death of, not caused by crucifixion, 51, 181, 221, 328. Post-crucifixion, appearance of, 331. Burden of sins as the cause of the death of 333. Older views against the death by crucifixion of, 334. Absurdity of the ascension of, 336, 341. Not foretold in Dentronomy, 359. Not an Israelite, 359. Not the like of Moses, 360. Advent of Elijah, a sign of the truth of, 371. Difficulties of Jews in recognising, 372. Messianic prophecies not fulfilled in. 371. Responsibility of Jews in rejecting, 374. Importance of the doctrine of resurrection of, 390. Time of the stay of, upon earth after crucifixion 391. Nature of post-crucifixion, appearance of, 392. Ascension of, not bodily but spiritual, 417. Death of, according to the Quran, 418. The denial of, with reference to his second advent, 420. The name of, applied to Muslims in the Quran, 421. Concurrence of opinion among the companions of the Holy Prophet as to the death of, 423. Mission of, to ten tribes, 424. Brothers and sisters of, 425. Sixteen characteristics of, 426. Not an exception to other prophets in point of sinlessness, 467. First 30 years of, 475. No divinity in, 195, 479. Miracles of, 479.

Joasaph, 199

John of Damascus, 199

John, supernaturalness in the birth of, 100

Jonas, flight of and refutation of charges against, 264. Sign of, 9, 181, 329.

Josaph at, see Barlam. Identity of, with Yusasaf, 463

Joseph, dream of, 15

Joseph of Ariniathæa, 54

Josephus, 183

Judaism, state of, at the advent of Islam, 159. Doctrine of Unity in, 159.

Judas Iscariot, 342.

Junah, see *Zanb*.

Jurm, 37. See *Zanb*. Jews guilty of Jurm according to Quran, 243.

K

Kabul, Cholera in, 451

Karim Bakhsh of Jamalpur 433

King-Emperor, the coronation of 20

Knowledge, Divine, the sources of, 205. Three degrees of, 205. Information, a source of, 206. Former inspirations of prophets when a source of, 206. Reason a source of, 207. Conscience or human nature a source of, 208. Inspiration a source of perfect, 209, 214. Highest degree of the certainty of, 215.

L

La'n, see Course.

Law, objection against change of, considered, 153

Lefroy, Dr., in the moral tone of India, 247

Lekhram, death of, in accordance with the prophecy of the Promised Messiah, 19, 146, 148. Prophecy concerning and that published by, 245

Literary Digest, (extract from), 343

Love, see Divine.

Lubab-un-naqool fi Asbab-in-Nazool, 300, 302, 318.

M.

Pages.

Mahdi, the bloody, advent of, 23
Marham-i-Isa, see Ointment of Jesus.
Martyrdoms, prophecy relating to the two, 450
Martyrs, story of the two, 405
Mary, reason for calling, *siddiqa* (*i.e.*, a righteous woman), 99, 196.
McCuskey, Mr., 400
Messiah, see Promised.
Messiah, resemblance bet. Muhammadan and Israelite, 24. Signification of, 66. The second advent of, 363, 405. True notions respecting the person of, 363. The suffering and the victorious, 344. Second advent of, solution of the question of, 364. Jewish expectations as to the time of the advent of, 365. Christian calculations as to the time of the second advent of, 365. Time fixed by the Holy Quran as to the second advent of, 368; Signs mentioned in the Quran, 369; in the traditions, 369; time fixed by the revelations of Muslim saints, 370. Manner of the advent of, 371. Predicted state of the world at the second advent of, 378. The promised, not identical with Jesus, 379, 414. To be from among the Muslims, 415, 435. *Nazool*, or descent of, 435
Messianic, belief, birth of, 363. Era, 363. Prophecy, importance of, 364. See Jesus. Prophecies, Jewish and Christian, a comparison of, 375, 376.
Millenial Dawn, 366
Miracle, See Quran, Jesus Holy Prophet.
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, see Promised Messiah.
Monro, Mr., on sinlessness, 230. 249, 289, 351, 467. Communication from, 351.
Moon, a manifestation of Divine power, 123.
Morals, both phases of life necessary for a display of high, 219
Moses, refutation of charges against, 271
Muhaddisin, 315
Muhammad, see Prophet, the holy.
Muhammadans, increase of, in India, 196. See Muslim.
Muslim, collection of traditions by, 176
Muslim, prayer, 126; three things taught by, 127. Wars, the object of and necessity for early, 170, 219. Wars, odds in early, 172.
Muslims, sufferings of early, 171
Muta', 142
Myrrh, 394

N.

Nadwa, house of, 18
Nanak, discovery of the chola of, 29. King of Arabia and, 30. Miracle of, restoring a dead elephant to life, 189.
Nasr ud Din, Sayyid, 456
Nature, worship of the forces of, 119
Nuzool, See Messiah.
"New York Commercial Advertiser" (extract from), 480
Niyoga, 139, 157. Request for a list of those subjected to, 143. Custom of, disproves, 157.
Noah, refutation of charges against, 259. Ark, of, 146

O.

Ointment of Jesus, 332, 393. Medical works speaking of, 394. Importance of evidence furnished by, 397.
Ointment of Apostles, see Ointment of Jesus.

P.

Panacea, for the poison of sin, 145
Parable, of the lion and travellers, 168. Of the poor man who claimed to be a King, 188.
Physical forces, the power of God works in, 129
Pigott, J. H. Smyth (claiming to be Jesus Christ), prophecy of the death of, 349, 476, 478.
Pilate, 53. Dream of the wife of, 15, 181.
Plague, spiritual causes of the, 88. A prayer to be saved from the, 109.
Prayer, supplications in, in one's own language, 179. Five daily, photographs of the five-fold condition of man, 179. Proposed duel of, 343, 346. Taught to Muslims, 414. See Muhammadan.
Prince-Prophet, See Yusasf.
Promised Messiah, the false case of abetment of murder against, 18, 28. Journey of, to Dera Nanak, 32. Revelations of, 42, 84, 407. Original home of the ancestors of, 62. Death of the father of, 63. As a Judge (hakam), 65, 66. Spiritual personality of, 67. At Jhelum, 83. Injunctions to followers, 86, 452. A wonderful vision of, 131. A personal anecdote of, 137. Two prophetic diseases of, 137. Heavenly signs of, 146. Objections to prophecies of, considered, 147. A vision of, 158. Lecture of, at the great religious conference, 205. Cases against, 288. Signs of the advent of 342, 406, 455. Age of, 348. Article on sinlessness by, 354, 355. Prophecies of relating to his mission, 402. Heavenly message

P.-*Contd.*

Pages.

intrusted to, 405. Arguments in support of the claims of, 412. Advent of, 444, 16; characteristics of, 429. Prophecy as to appearance of, in India, 435. Prophecy as to the name of the village of, 435. Reasons for calling, a prophet, 436. Descent of in two yellow mantles, 437. Prophecy of the safety of, 447. Signs shown for, are not shown for impostors, 454. Prophecy of, relating to the spread of his followers in all countries, 455. Parables of, see parable.

Promised Messiahship, arguments in support of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claim to, 412.

Prophecies, See Ahmadiyya, Abdul Latif, Promised Messiah.

Prophecy, liability of error in the interpretation of, 327.

Prophet, the Holy, transformation wrought by, 1. Three stages of the teachings of, 4. Followers of, 7. Plots for the murder of, 18. Second advent of, its object and meaning, 35. Need of, asserted by the Holy Quran, 43. Consummation effected by, 48. Farewell pilgrimage of, 50. Corruption of Jews and Christians at the advent of, 164. Two periods of the life of, 217; object of the division, 217. Sacrifice of life effected by, 218. Sinlessness of, according to traditions, 245. Refutation of charges against, 297. A contrast of, with Jesus, 316. Prophecies concerning, in C. T., 358. Claimed to fulfil them, 361. Is the "That Prophet" referred to in Deut. is, 362. Eminent sinlessness of, 473 (See also Prophets, sinlessness of). First forty years of, 475.

Prophets, why, are raised, 70. Complete submission of, to God, 73. Controversy on the sinlessness of, 226. Sinlessness of, according to the Holy Quran, 246, 249, 289, 467. Mohro on sinlessness of, 249, 289, 351, 467. Sinlessness of, generally believed by the Muslims, 249. Sin not applicable to, 251. Nature of fear displayed by, 298, 309, 310. Special Divine protection in the case of certain, 447. Verses proving the sinlessness of, 469.

Punjab Census Report, on the Ahmadiyya sect, 82. An error in, 83.

Q.

Pages.

Qatada, story of, and his uncle, 318

Quran the Holy, three stages of the teachings of, 4. A miracle of power and knowledge, 5, 6. Superhuman origin of, 6. Doctrine of, relating to the granting of different revelations to different people, 133. General tenor of the teachings of, 139. Need of, 159, 167. Unity of God as taught by, 160. Needed to settle the differences of Jews and Christians, 161. Negatives the subjection of Jesus to curse, 161. What was done by, 161. Objections against the need of apply to all revelations, 165. Laws and injunctions of lay down general rules, 170. Appeals to reason, 207. Speaks of the death of Jesus, 221. Rules to be observed in the interpretation of, 250. Claim of, as to pure Divine origin, 388.

R.

Rafa', 417

Rama, 140, 157

Rauza Sahib, 202

Religion, amount of research necessary for a change of, 92, 94. Supposition of Divine origin of all——s, 281.

Resemblance between Jewish and Muslim systems, 412

Revelation, See Promised Messiah, inspiration. Principle governing repeated, 165.

Revelations of Moses, Jesus and the Holy Prophet compared, 162

Revolutions, spiritual, 128

Ruhulla, 195

S.

Sakat Mat (a Hindoo sect), 282

Sanatan Dharma, 106, 115, 155

Sanskrit, revelation in, 133

Satyarath Parkash, 139, 141

Scheintod 335

Schbiermacher, 334

Schmiedel, 195, 383, 478

Seasons, variety of, a symbol of spiritual changes, 128

Shahzada Nabi, see Yus Asaf.

Shalmaneser, 11

Shara (law), signification of, 287

Sikh ascendency, 62

Sin, 251

Sinlessness, See prophets.

Sita, see Rama.

S.-*Contd.*

Pages.

Son of God, 328
Soul, Dayanand's conception of, 141
Spear-thrust 184
Srinagar, has the same significance as Golgotha 224
Star, at the birth of Jesus, See Jesus.
Strauss, 334
Suicide, an act of foolishness, 218
Sun, the spiritual 121
Sunday Circle (extract from) 349
sunnat, see custom.
Supernatural religion (extract from) 335
Sutee. 157

T.

Tabri 314
Tarikh-i-Azami 461
Tati-ul-anam 190
Teachings, see Quran, Gospel, Vedas, Arya Samaj. Secret underlying the extreme severity of Mosaic, extreme mildness of Gospel and middleness of the Quranic, 167. Refutation of objection against the imperfection of Masoic and Gospel, 169.
Thomas, the apostle, 341
Tomb of Jesus, See Jesus.
Traditions, See prophets. Value of, 173. Authenticity of how to be judged, 174. Different Muslim sects have different, 175. Jews led astray by, 175.
Transmigration of souls 141
Trinity, 325. Not to be traced in Jewish teachings, 326.

U.

Unguentum Apostolorum, See Ointment of Jesus.
Unity, of God, See Quran, Judaism.
Universities, an appeal to, 381
Upson, Mr., 230
Unveiling the daughters of an aged mother, 367

V.

Pages.

Vedas, the teachings of, 115, 118, 125, 128 132, 139. Exposure of the apparent error of, 126.

W.

Weitbrecht, Rev., 458
Word of God, signs of the reception of, 212 Recepient of the, 213——incarnate, 361.

Y.

Yogis, the religion of, 155
Yus Asaf, 197, 330, 337, 458. Not a corruption of Buddha, 464. Significance and origin of the word, 465

Z.

Zacharius, blood of, 16
Zaid, See Prophet, the holy, refutation of charges against. Traditions relating to the marriage of, with Zainab, 300.
Zainab, See Prophet, the holy, refutation of charges against; Zaid. War relationship of, to the Holy Prophet, 301. Divorce of, 306. Marriage of, with the Prophet, 308, 312.
Zanb, considerations determining the meaning of, 37, 234, 356.
Zunnun, See Jonah.
Zussinnain, 432

بسم ا لله ا لرحمن ا لرحيم

نحمد ه و نصلى على رسوله ا لكريم

The Transformation wrought by the Holy Prophet.

To have an idea of the miraculous transformation wrought by the greatest benefactor of mankind, the Holy Prophet that was born in the land of Hedjaz, it is necessary to cast a glance at the state of Arabia before and after his appearance. Before his advent, the Arabs worshipped strange gods and paid Divine honors to idols made of stone. They had no faith in the unity of God and in the day of judgment. They were in love with their false deities and attributed to them Divine powers. They believed that none but their idols brought about rain and made the earth yield its produce, and that the idols created the embryo in the womb and had full control over things pertaining to life and death. Every false god found in them ready believers. Each one of them believed himself to be under the patronage of a special deity before whom he bowed down. To him he addressed his supplications and prayers in time of distress, to him he looked up for the reward of his good works and before him he laid his needs and complaints. They were quite ignorant of the truth and walked in the dark and crooked paths of falsehood. They were content with their false gods and had no higher aspirations. They laboured under the delusion that their idols alone could answer their prayers and that God Himself was too high to meddle with human affairs. They firmly adhered to the belief that God had delegated to their deities dominion over the worlds of spirit and matter and invested them with all the Divine powers, Himself keeping aloof from this world. They were fully persuaded that their idols interceded for them

with God, brought them into His nearness, gave them relief from their pains and led them to all sorts of success.

This is a brief summary of the religion of the pre-Islamic Arabs, the practical outcome of which was that they plunged themselves headlong into all sorts of brutal excesses, and what gave a still darker tinge to this picture was that they took a savage pride in their sins. They freely indulged in adultery and theft, murdered the innocent and robbed the stranger, ate up the property of orphans, oppressed the poor and tyrannized over the weak, and committed all sorts of sin without fear of retribution. They brought low the dignity of human nature and fell away from morality. They sank into wickedness and became like wild beasts. They ate the flesh of their brethren with avidity and drank their blood as if it were milk. In their revolt against God they went beyond all bounds. Their poets out of sheer impudence sang songs insulting to the fair sex. The rich among them amused themselves with drinking, gambling and quarrelling. Those who claimed to be thrifty trampled upon the rights of widows and orphans and their own blood-relations, and wasted their gains in the gratification of their carnal desires. One of the most horrible features of Arab society was infanticide. They made away with their children for fear of poverty and despatched their daughters in particular because they thought it a disgrace to give them in marriage. They were characterized by all the base and beastly qualities which can disgrace human nature. Fornication was so commonly practised by their men and women that a large section of their society was composed of men of illegitimate birth. If there was some one among them who was pure-minded and detested their evil deeds, he had not the moral courage to express his abhorrence and utter words of counsel for fear of his own life and property. To be brief, the Arabs were a people who had never heard the voice of a preacher and were utter strangers to virtue and piety. There were very few among them who were truthful or just.

In such dark days when all Arabia was corrupt to the core and its people were utterly polluted from within as well as from without, there appeared among them a prophet at Mecca. But they rejected him and refused to listen to his healing words. With a

stubborn perverseness they persisted in their evil ways, and actuated by spite began to persecute their best well-wisher. He held up under their persecutions and bore them patiently. He met their malice with benevolence and always returned good for evil and approached them like a well-meaning and sincere friend. For a long time he walked about the streets of Mecca, friendless and alone. On the one hand, he bore his sufferings with apostolic patience, and on the other, spent whole nights in praying for his benighted countrymen. At last his prayers were answered and the sun of truth shone forth in its full effulgence. In a short time Arabia was completely transformed. The hearts of seekers after truth were drawn to him with a mighty magnetism and every lover of truth began to seek the pleasure of the Lord. It seemed as if angels had come down from heaven to cast their holy influence over the hearts of men. Those who accepted the chosen one of God, showed extraordinary zeal for his cause. They laid down their lives for his sake and sealed their sincerity with their blood. By their deeds they proved to the world that they were the true and faithful servants of God. In the days of ignorance they were immersed in the depths of darkness, but the religion of God brought them into light and liberty. Their evil dispositions were changed for virtuous inclinations. Their nocturnal orgies gave place to heart-felt prayers and their morning draughts, to singing the praises of God. When they had gained the utmost firmness of conviction, they made the service of God the end of their existence, and in this cause they laid down their lives and spent money without stint. Their practice conformed with their doctrine and showed how beautiful and fraught with blessings their faith was.

In order to put their faith to the severest possible test, they threw themselves into all sorts of danger and trials. This it was that made them so brave and so happy. This it was that braced their hearts and confirmed their belief and gave certainty to their knowledge. They put themselves into the crucible of God's love until their souls were wholly purged of the dross of earthliness and thus purified found union with God. They cleared the ways of the Lord. The path was full of thorns but to them it appeared as strewn with flowers. It was beset with terrible difficulties but to them

its very difficulties proved inviting. Let one think for an instant how they forsook their former lawless lives and put down their wild and riotous passions, and he will be firmly convinced that all this wonderful change was due only to the healing influence of the grand personality of one Divine physician.

Indeed it was Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him,—that great Prophet whom God had chosen and trained under his special care—who first made the Arabs aware of the dignity of human nature and laid before them the beauty and grandeur of man's soul. Think over the sublimity of that spiritual life whose salutary example brought about such a marvellous spiritual awakening. Reflect upon the lives of the companions who rose from the depths of degradation and soared aloft until they reached the highest point of spiritual perfection. The Prophet found them living beastly lives, utterly strangers to God and His ways and possessing no definite ideas of right and wrong. He instructed them in the rules of right conduct and taught them how to lead righteous lives. He impressed upon them the necessity of purity, and gave them the minutest directions by which they could adopt the habits of cleanliness. He taught them to dress decently and gave them rules of hygene and laws of preserving health. Above all, he laid much stress upon their always adopting the mean in all things. In short, he remodelled their whole society. When the savage Arabs had thoroughly mastered the rules of keeping their bodies clean, he drew their attention to moral duties and the virtues of faith, that through them they might attain to spiritual purity. When he found that they had been fully settled in the habits of morality and had become fixedly averse to what is morally sinful or hateful in the sight of God, and a new propensity to virtuous actions had been created in them, he initiated them into the Divine mysteries. He created in them a deep love for the source of all beauty and a burning desire for union with Him that they might rest in Him and find enjoyment in Him everlastingly.

The teachings of the Holy Prophet as embodied in the Holy Quran are graduated and can be marked off into three stages according to the different stages of a man's moral and spiritual development. The first stage comprehends rules calculated to lift up

natural man from his savage and primitive state and to supply him with rudiments of morals. The second stage consists of a sublime and perfect system of ethics fitted to elevate man to the height of perfection as a moral being. The third stage is meant to make the moral man godly in the true sense of the word. At this stage man loses himself wholly in God and resigns himself completely to His will. Everywhere he sees the hand of God and finds no trace of himself or of anything else besides God. To him God is all in all. This is the final stage in the course of a seeker after God and is styled *istiqamat* in the opening chapter of the Quran. Here all his labours are brought to an end. Here carnal desires vanish away, and self is conquered. Here the demon of lust is crushed to rise no more and the turmoil of passions ceases once for all. Then it is said: لمن الملک الیوم للہ الواحد القہار "To whom does all dominion belong to-day? To God, the Almighty, the Great." But the man who at his best is but moral and no more, and who has not found union with God, has not got beyond the reach of danger. The devil may claim him still as his own and the demon of lust may still get the mastery over him. Still greater victories are to be won and still mightier conquests are to be made. The man who is not wholly annihilated in God, cannot be proof against the arrows of appetite.

The glory belongs to the Holy Quran that it carries a man to the haven of perfect security, that high and sacred place where Satan is not allowed to set foot. Through this book man is raised to the highest point of perfection he is capable of. The case is quite different with other books claiming a Divine origin. They contain only the most elementary principles of morality, and fall far short of the high standard revealed by the Quran. While it contains a perfect revelation of God's will, they are but partial and incomplete. In this respect the Quran may be called a miracle of our Prophet—a miracle not only of knowledge but of power also. The miracles associated with the names of other prophets are stale and out of date. They remain confined only in books and have no practical value whatever. But the Quran shall remain a standing miracle for all times. That this claim is not a mere empty vaunt but rests on the solid ground of fact, may be shown by the following considerations :—

Firstly, the Quran comprehends all the necessary doctrines, precepts and directions which may not only guide man safely through the journey of life but also impart to him the most clear and certain knowledge respecting God, and show him the nearest and the surest way of seeing Him.

Secondly, the Quran advances the most convincing arguments in support of its truth, and we can draw upon its treasures of Divine wisdom for the refutation of all false systems of religion.

Thirdly, the language of the Quran is so sweet, beautiful and sublime, and the phrases used by it are so apt and so well chosen, that it has always defied and still defies comparison and has always won the reverential homage of the most eminent poets and orators of the world. It is moreover easy and simple and this fact further enhances its beauty. Are not these important facts sufficient to testify to the superhuman origin of the Quran ?

We have said that the Quran is not only a miracle of knowledge but also a miracle of power. This is as clear as day. The wonderful spiritual influence exerted by the Holy Quran, and the marvellous transformation brought about by its teachings, have always puzzled philosophers. It has moved the hardest heart, renewed the most perverted will and regenerated the most depraved disposition and has thus proved to the satisfaction of all persons not blinded by prejudice, that it was not Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, but the Almighty God working in him that effected all this. A deep and impassable gulf lay between man and God; the Quran filled it up. Men were at war with truth, the Quran reconciled them to it. Those who brought themselves under its beneficient influence made such progress in spirituality that many of them had personal communion with God and were favored with heavenly signs which were made a heritage for all true believers in the Prophet. It is for this reason that if we are asked to show signs, we are not compelled to refer to ancient times but Almighty God favors us with them in the same manner as he favored the companions of the Prophet. The sacred books of our opponents, on the other hand, are full of meaningless fables and childish stories which serve no purpose to establish truth. They are wholly destitute of the Divine light which never

goes out but shines brightly for ever more. The Quran as a miracle is, therefore, sublime in both its aspects. Its blessings are wide and its miraculousness has been certified by all people.

There is another thing. If some great philosopher were to take in hand the work of reformation, he will find the reformation of a single person hardened in vice an almost impossible task. From this we may guage the greatness of the person who in a short period of time transformed a whole nation. He pulled down the fabric of their infidelity and led them into the paths of righteousness and piety. Their very faces bore witness that they loved their Lord with a mighty love. In the cause of truth, they exerted all the powers of their body and mind, and went forth, alone and resourceless, to preach the word of God to all people of the earth. Their intellect became refined and their understanding became fitted for the comprehension of Divine mysteries. They began to shun all manner of sin and every appearance of evil, and there was implanted in them a deep love for what is good and a fixed aversion to what is bad. The men who once bowed down before idols became now the champions of Islam. They spared no pains to spread Islam until it became the religion of Arabia, Persia, Asia Minor and several other countries, and went eastward as far as China. All places where infidelity reigned supreme were visited by them, and all countries where strange gods were worshipped heard their preaching. They faced death but never fell back; were cut down but always stuck to their post. As warriors of God they ran even into the jaws of death but never deserted the standard of Islam. In this way they went to the very extremities of the earth. As rulers and administrators they proved that they were the best the world ever saw. Their practice conformed to their doctrine and in both they excelled the rest of the world. In fact this was one of the greatest miracles and is a standing testimony to the truth of the Divine origin of his revelations and the reality of revelation itself. Not a single instance of this can be produced from among the followers and companions of any other prophet, not even the followers of Moses and Jesus.

Jesus among the ten lost Israelite Tribes in the East.

We gave Jesus and his mother a refuge on a lofty place which was secure and watered with springs. (Alquran).

I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (Matt. 15-24).

And other sheep I have which are not of this fold.....they shall hear my voice. (John 10 : 16).

THE subject that shall appear under this heading in this and the subsequent issues of this magazine is so vast and important a subject and subverts so many cherished theories that it could have been satisfactorily treated only in a respectable volume. From the necessity of circumstances, however, we have been obliged to present it to the public in seperate portions. Yet so supreme is the importance of the subject and so weighty the results to which it gives rise that, however, it may suffer from brevity and division into parts, it will still possess an unabated interest for all seekers after truth. It will, moreover, prepare the reader for a more comprehensive treatment of the subject in a volume which though yet incomplete is expected to be out as soon as circumstances allow.

Under the principal heading there are various sub-headings according to the different sources from which evidence has been drawn. Each sub-heading represents a particular link in the strong chain which establishes the truth of the statement contained in the principal heading.

EVIDENCE FROM THE GOSPELS--I.

We consider first of all the evidence of the Gospels as to the subject in hand. The credibility of the Gospels has been so shaken of late that our placing them at the top may be surprising to many. It is now an established fact and admitted not only by almost all the critics of the Gospels but also by professing Christians that they were written long after the events narrated in them, that they are a very imperfect record of those events and that they contain many incorrect statements, exaggerations and mythical tales. In the light of criticism the Gospels may be broadly divided into two parts. The part which,

contains the teachings of Jesus gives, seldom in original and generally in an altered form, the words of Jesus himself, and this part may, therefore, be considered as containing fragmentary inspirations. The other part which relates the events of Jesus' life must be treated on an historical basis and received or rejected according to the probability or improbability of the occurrence of the events and the strength or weakness of the evidence. Many facts might have been lost and not a few altered in the course of oral transmission. Even the part that should have been retained by memory, must have been affected by the associations and prejudices of the mediums and afterwards of the writers.

These very circumstances give additional weight to the nature of the evidence which we draw from the Gospels. It is just on the point to keep which secret was the one object of their writers. Somehow or other, the error crept early into the Christian belief that Jesus had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven. The Christian writers who wrote the Gospels, wrote them under the influence of this belief, and the plainest circumstances in Jesus' life received a tinge from the predominance of this belief in the minds of the narrators and the writers. A few hours' suspension on the cross could not bring about the death of a person, yet so great was the force of the erroneous belief that in spite of this circumstance and Pilate's wonder expressed even then, the Christian writers represented Jesus as dead. Seeing then that the writers of the Gospels wrote under the influence of a particular belief and distorted the circumstances of Jesus' life as far as they could so as to suit them to that belief, any evidence which their writings afford against the belief, must be considered of the highest value. It is upon this consideration that we have first of all considered the evidence afforded by the Gospels.

First of all, we have in support of our contention the prophecy of Jesus as to his own fate recorded in Matt. 12: 39, 40, and Luke 11: 29, 30: "There shall be no sign given to it, but the sign of Jonas, the prophet. For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Now it is admitted that Jonas entered *alive* into the whale's belly and also came out *alive*. Jesus tells us that he shall be in the heart of the earth in the same manner as Jonas was in the whale's belly. In other words, he shall enter *alive* "into the heart of

the earth" and come out *alive*. If Jesus did not enter alive "into the heart of the earth," there is not the least resemblance between him and Jonas. In this case the words of Jesus must be regarded false. If Jonas did not die, Jesus must have been alive also, for there can be no similarity between the living and the dead. The truth is that Jesus was a righteous prophet of God and he prophesied as God had revealed to him that he shall be saved from the accursed death on the cross. In adducing his similarity with the prophet Jonas he, therefore, foretold his own fate and informed those about him that he shall not die upon the cross, but shall like Jonas be only in a state of senselessness, and in that state he shall be in the "heart of the earth" as Jonas was in the belly of the whale. No other meaning can be attached to the words of the prophecy. The resemblance which Jesus intended to point out between himself and Jonas was in the state of their lying, the one in the heart of the earth and the other in the belly of the whale. The Christian dogma, however, assumes the death of Jesus and the life of Jonas, and thus makes the prophecy utterly devoid of meaning. If Jesus died upon the cross, he could not be in the heart of the earth *as* Jonas was in the belly of the whale. In that case he should have stated his resemblance with some dead man and not with the only person in the Jewish religious history who was actually alive while in a state of apparent death. Jesus had clearly warned those about him, that seeing him in a state of apparent death and even in a grave, they should not take him for a dead man, for his case will be like that of Jonas who was dead to all appearance though actually alive. Nay, there was a greater probability of the death of Jonas than that of Jesus. Jonas was thrown into a stormy sea and was swallowed by a fish and there he remained for three days and three nights. Under these circumstances there was very little likelihood of his being alive, yet God saved him from the jaws of death. Jesus, on the other hand, remained on the cross only for three hours and this short interval was, by no means, sufficient to bring about his death by the slow process of the cross. When taken down, he was given in the charge of a wealthy disciple who lavished care upon him and kept him in a large room, hewn in the side of a rock, for one day and two nights, using all kinds of spices, etc., to restore him from the state of senselessness into which he had fallen. Therefore, even to appearance, there was far greater probability of the death of Jonas than that of Jesus. The prophecy of Jesus was, there-

fore, meant to inform his disciples and the Jews that when God was able to save the life of Jonas, when apparent circumstances showed him to be a dead man, it would be far more easy with Him to save his life and cause him to be kept in earth in the same manner as Jonas was kept in the belly of the whale.

Jesus had, moreover, said that the sign of Jonas, the prophet, shall be given to the Jews who demanded a sign of him. "As Jonas was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the son of man be to this generation." Now the manner in which Jonas was a sign, was that after passing through a great trial in which he had lost his life to all appearance, he was charged with a mission to *his own people*, the Ninevites. In the same manner was Jesus to be a sign, *viz.*, that after passing through a great trial in which he should have been taken for a dead man, he was to be sent to *his own people*, the Israelites. As Jonas was afterwards accepted and honored by his people, so was also to be Jesus. Though the two Jewish tribes that lived in Palestine and its vicinity rejected him, yet the majority, the remaining ten Israelite tribes should have received him with due honor. These ten tribes had been carried off to the east by Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, after the ravage of Samaria, and as we shall show further, they afterwards settled in Afghanistan, Cashmere, parts of Tibet and other eastern countries. It was to those Israelites that Jesus went after suffering at the hands of his countrymen and it was by them that he was received with honour and thus fulfilled his similarity with Jonas which he had asserted prophetically. It was to these that he referred as those "other sheep which are not of this fold." These did he collect upon one faith, and thus fulfilled the great object of his life as Jonas did by going to the Ninevites. These words of Jesus, moreover, clearly disprove his alleged ascension to heaven. He plainly denies every other sign, except the sign of Jonas, the prophet. Jonas never showed the sign of going up to heaven. His only sign was that he was saved from the jaws of death and afterwards went to preach the Word of God to his people who accepted him. This very sign, *and no other*, ought to have been shown by Jesus who plainly negatived every sign "except the sign of Jonas, the prophet." Therefore, it is clear from this prophecy that Jesus was taken down alive from the cross and that after recovery, he went to preach the Word of God to his own lost people, the Israelites, and that the theories of his death upon the cross and ascension to heaven, are absolutely false.

That Jesus did not die upon the cross is also apparent from another consideration. The Old Testament says that the person who dies upou the cross, is accursed of God (Deut. 21 : 23). Now the signification of curse is of such a nature that it cannot be applied to any righteous man. Curse is a translation of the Hebrew word *la'n* which is the same as the Arabic لعن, *la'n*. All the Arabic lexicographers agree that the import of لعن (curse) has reference to the moral and spiritual condition of a man. Hebrew and Arabic being very closely related languages and the word لعن being the same in both, there is no difference in its signification in the two languages. Now a person is said to be ملعون or accursed when he turns away from God, and his heart is hardened so that he becomes totally destitute of the grace of God and utterly devoid of the true love and knowledge of his Creator. His eyes are closed against the light of truth and darkness pervades his soul so that it keeps no longer any communication with its Maker. Subjected to the curse he is execrable like the spirit of evil. There is extreme hatred and abhorrence between him and God. He becomes the enemy of God, and God in His anger and fury visits him with His wrath. It is for this reason that Satan is called لعين or ملعون, *i.e.* the accursed one. The meaning attached to لعن (curse) being so abhorrent, it is clear that the word can be used only of those who have gone beyond all limits in their wickedness. لعن or curse is as much opposed to righteousness as light is to darkness. In introducing the dogma of Jesus' death upon the cross, the Christians acted very inadvertently and paid no heed to the meaning of the word لعن. Had they reflected upon its meaning, they would certainly have refrained from applying such an abusive and disgraceful term to their Messiah. Can we imagine that for a moment the heart of Jesus turned away from God and that he became the enemy of his Divine master ? Is it possible that such a darkness should have ever found access to one whose heart and soul had been illumined with true light and permeated with the love and knowledge of God ? One is at a loss to understand how the curse of God, nay thousands of curses with all their abominable consequences, could have come down upon the heart of a righteous servant of God, of a prophet who was sent to reclaim his people from the power of Satan. The desire of salvation is an admirable thing in itself, but alas! that a man's yearning for salvation should

lead him to pervert truth to such an extent as to hold that a righteous prophet of God had ever become so wicked that the communion of his soul with the Lord of the universe had been cut off, and his love for God and the light of truth in him had given place to His enmity and utter darkness. Such a belief about Jesus is not only derogatory to his apostolic dignity but also contradicts his own claims to perfection, purity and love for God which occur so often in the Gospels. Can light and darkness dwell in the mind side by side? Can the same soul hold communion with God and with Satan at once? Or is it possible that love and enmity of God should rule the same heart simultaneously? This disproves the theory of Jesus' death upon the cross, and hence also the allegation of his ascension to heaven falls to the ground. But if Jesus did not die upon the cross, he must have gone to his other Israelite brethren who had settled in the far east.

The Gospels afford another evidence. They report the words of Jesus in which he affirmed that he had been sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 15 : 24), and that he had come "to seek and save that which was lost." Luke 19: 10. Now if the Jews, living in Palestine, must be regarded as lost, the Israelites who had settled farther away from the centre must be *a priori* so, for they were lost physically as well as spiritually. He further said that he had come to *seek* that which was lost, and this can, by no means, apply to any but the Israelites who lived farther off from Palestine. The Jews of Palestine had assembled about him in large numbers and, therefore, it was not necessary to seek them. Nor is he reported to have ever sought the Jews of Palestine but always took care to hide himself from them. He further cites the parable of a man who "goeth into the mountains, and seeketh" the one sheep that is gone astray and leaves the ninety-nine. This parable is applicable to none better than Jesus. He came for the Israelites but the place where he began his work had only two out of their twelve tribes and the rest ten were scattered abroad. He who taught that a man should wander into the mountains for the sake of a single sheep, must be a great sinner if he did not go out in search of the ten tribes for whom he had been sent. On the other hand, it was his first duty that he should have taken care of the majority and left the minority to its fate. It is easy to see that the more important business of Jesus was to preach to the greater number and this he could not do

unless he went abroad in search of the ten tribes who had been lost, because they had no relations with the Palestinian Jews. At any rate, it is clear that Jesus' mission was to the whole house of Israel and not to any particular branch of it. It had been prophesied regarding him that he "shall rule" God's "people Israel." If he died upon the cross and went up to heaven, the object of his coming which is again and again described in the Gospels as the deliverance of the house of Israel and especially of its lost sheep, remained hopelessly unfulfilled. If he did not escape with his life from the cross and go to the ten tribes, then instead of delivering the Israelites from sins, he burdened them with greater sins which they committed against him.

There is another evidence in the Gospels of Jesus' going to the east. The star which indicated his birth appeared in the east (Matt. 2 : 2). Guided by this star certain wise men undertook a long journey and visited the place of his birth. This shows clearly that they had been waiting for his appearance. Now, the promise of the appearance of a Messiah and the signs of his advent had been given to none but the Israelite people. The men, therefore, that came from the east on seeing the star must have been Israelites. These two circumstances, *viz.*, the appearance of the star in the east and the visit of the wise men from the east, could not have heen meaningless. Why did the star that indicated the birth of a Messiah, appear in the east if the eastern people were not destined to be guided by him ? There is also a clear indication here that the eastern Israelites shall have more benefit from the appearance of the Messiah than his countrymen. The star appeared to the eastern Israelites and not to the western, thus clearly indicating that the Palestinian Israelites shall not accept him while he shall be received with honor in the east. The star of his birth was really the star of his success and prosperity in his mission and this was in the east. Why did God guide the eastern people by the star if His prophet was never destined to go to them? It would be strange, indeed, if the eastern people should have been informed of the appearance of the Messiah who had to preach only in the west, whereas the western Israelites among whom he was to preach were given no such sign. The signs of God are not shown in vain and this one had a deep meaning under it. Jesus, moreover, would have been guilty of a great ingratitude if he had not gone to the people who had come to receive him

from the far east even at his birth. The eastern Israelites welcomed his birth while the western ones conspired his death; which of these two deserved to be the true flock of the Messiah, it is easy to see.

Of the evidences of Jesus' escape with his life from the cross, is the dream of Pilate's wife related in Matt. 27 : 19 : " When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying : ' Have thou nothing to do with this just man ; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." The appearance of the angel to the wife of Pilate in her dream is a sure sign that Jesus did not die on the cross. Never since the world was created has it ever happened that God should inspire a person for saving one of His chosen servants and the plan should fail. The Gospels themselves furnish another instance. The angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying : " Arise and take the young child and his mother and flee into Egypt and be thou there until I bring thee word : for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him " (Matt. 2 : 13). The appearing of the angel to Joseph in a dream was a sure sign that the king shall not be able to carry his design against the child's life into execution. Similarly did the angel of the Lord appear to the wife of Pilate to save Jesus from the accursed death on the cross, and it was impossible that the Divine plan should have failed. In fact the two cases afford a parallel. As in the former case, the death of the child Jesus would have been against the promise of the Lord to Joseph, so in the latter the death of Jesus on the cross would have been against the word His angel brought to Pilate's wife. Every sensible person would easily realize that the angel had not appeared to Pilate's wife in vain. He appeared to express the Divine will that Jesus should be saved from the death on the cross. It is, moreover, difficult to understand why the angel put himself to trouble for Jesus' safety if it was the Lord's will that he should die on the cross. How can this difference between God and His angel be explained ? An angel is only a minister for the execution of Divine will and it is, therefore, plain that his appearance to Pilate's wife was in obedience to the Divine command which was that Jesus should not die upon the cross. To assert the death of Jesus upon the cross in the face of this clear and conclusive evidence, is to reject the most obvious truth. Pilate's washing his hands also attests to the truth of his wife's dream.

Matthew also reports the words of Jesus in which we have another evidence that Jesus did not die upon the cross. "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of the righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." (Matt. 23 : 35, 36). Here we are plainly told that Zacharias was the last of the righteous ones who suffered death at the hands of the Jews and whose blood was shed by this rebellious people. The words of the prophecy are very significant and clearly show that the death of Jesus was not the result of the plans of the Jews and, therefore, he did not die upon the cross. For if it were true that Jesus also like Zacharias was to fall a victim to the blood-thirstiness of the Jews, he would certainly have included himself among the righteous whose blood was shed by the Jews. Nor can it be reasonably asserted that although the Jews brought about the death of Jesus, yet they were not guilty of any sin, for he died as an atonement for the sins of others. Why was Judas Iscariot guilty of a grave sin for causing his arrest? Moreover Jesus himself asserts the sinfulness of the Jews for delivering him to Pilate, though in the words quoted above, he excludes himself from the righteous ones whose death was brought about by the Jews. In John 19 : 11, Jesus says to Pilate : "He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin," and in Matt. 26 : 24, he says : "Woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born."

A still stronger evidence of his not having died upon the cross is offered to us in Jesus' prayer the night before his arrest. On receiving an inspiration from Almighty God foretelling his arrest, he prayed to God with tears, supplications and prostrations. It is inconceivable that such an earnest appeal for which the Lord vouchsafed such a long time to Jesus should have been rejected. The prayer of a righteous person in distress and afflictions always meets with acceptance from the Lord. What reason have we then to suppose that the prayer of Jesus whom God loved and granted all that he asked, was in vain. We know further that Jesus himself was perfectly sure of the acceptance of his prayer by God, for when he was arrested and fastened to the cross and found all circumstances against his expectations and the

promise of God, he cried out, saying: "*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?*" that is to say, my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (Matt. 27:46). This cry of despair plainly tells us that he was perfectly sure of the acceptance of his prayer and had never for a moment thought that things would be brought to such a pass. His appeal at such a moment when all about him was despair, is meaningless, if it be supposed that he knew that his prayer was not accepted and that he must die. The words "why hast thou forsaken me" clearly point to a promise that he shall not be forsaken. All doubts on this point are removed by a plain statement elsewhere in the New Testament that his prayer had been accepted. "When he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death, and *was heard* in that he feared." (Heb. 5 : 7). (The italics are ours). No plainer testimony than this is needed to prove that the prayers and supplications of Jesus offered to God to save him from death, had been accepted by God and that, therefore, Jesus did not die upon the cross.

Not only did Jesus himself believe in the efficacy of prayer but he taught his followers the same. He laid much stress on indefatigable prayers to God and to this end spoke to his disciples the parable of the judge who feared not God nor regarded man (Luke 18 : 1-7). His object in stating the parable was to impress upon them the necessity of praying to God and to show that He listens to our prayers. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth," were his plain teachings. (Matt. 7 : 7). A man whose teachings and practice laid so much stress on prayer and its efficacy must have believed in the efficacy of his own prayers. It is true that God had informed him of an impending disaster, but like all true believers in God he had recourse to prayer, for he knew that there was nothing impossible with the Almighty, and He could do or undo anything whether within or beyond the control of man. If we were to suppose that the prayer of the teacher himself was rejected, all his teachings would come to naught. Moreover the fact of the rejection of the master's prayers would have cast an evil influence over the disciples. It would have shaken their belief to the very foundation,

for how could they believe in a God who did not assist His chosen prophet at the time of sore need and affliction and rejected the prayer of a sincere and supplicating mind. The truth is that Almighty God out of his infinite mercy granted the prayers of Jesus at Gethsemane and delivered him from the accursed death planned for him by the Jews.

It should also be borne in mind that as the chief priests, the scribes and the elders of the people assembled together in the palace of the high priest to consider measures to bring about the death of Jesus, a plot had also been formed to take the life of Moses, and a similar council of the leaders of the Quraish was convened at the *Dar un nadwa* (the Town Hall) of Mecca to murder the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. Out of these three noble prophets, the last two, it is admitted on all hands, were saved by Almighty God frustrating the evil designs of their wicked enemies. From this we may easily conclude that what happened in the case of these two prophets, also happened in the case of Jesus who on this occasion prayed for a longer time and even more earnestly than his great predecessor and his noble successor. If it is true that God listens to His beloved ones and frustrates the evil designs of their wicked enemies, why was not the prayer of Jesus accepted? The righteous ones have all borne witness to the fact that the prayer of an oppressed one in an afflicted state is surely efficacious. Nay, we know it for certain that to the chosen ones of God the time of great grief and sorrow is the time for the appearance of heavenly signs in their favor.

About five years ago, a false case of abetment of murder was brought against the Promised Messiah by a Christian Missionary, Dr. Henry Martyn Clarke of the Church Missionary Society of London, Amritsar (Punjab), in the Court of the District Magistrate of Gurdaspur. The prosecution charged the Messiah with having hired a certain Abdul Hamid for the murder of the said Missionary. Persons of three different nationalities, Christians, Hindoos and Muhammadans, were determined to bring destruction upon the head of the Promised Messiah with their united efforts. He had incurred the hostility of the Christian Missionaries by exposing their errors regarding their

belief about Jesus Christ. The cause of the enmity of the Hindoos lay in his prophesying the death of Lekh Ram, one of the foremost Arya preachers who demanded a heavenly sign regarding himself. The prophecy was fulfilled at the time and in the manner predicted and its fulfilment was an awful heavenly sign. The Muhammadan Maulvies hated him on account of his rejecting their views about the appearance of a bloody Mahdi and Messiah and the doctrine of *Jehad*. The object of all these people was to prove him guilty of murder and bring upon him the punishment of death or imprisonment. Before the case was instituted, God revealed to him their mischievous purpose and gave him also the glad tidings of ultimate acquittal. These divine revelations were published beforehand. On his prayer to God to avert the evil, He revealed to him that he shall be acquitted. This revelation was at that very time circulated among over 300 persons who can still bear witness to the fact. The prosecutor made out a *prima facie* case, and his subordinates assisted him by fabricating false evidence, but Captain Douglas, the Magistrate who was trying the case, found out at last that the case was really got up, and without showing any favor to the prosecutor who was a respectable Christian Missionary, dismissed the case. Similar incriminating charges were brought against the Promised Messiah on other occasions, but Almighty God always revealed to him the whole matter as well as the end which was the happy news of acquittal in all cases.

Thus does God always assist those who in their afflictions fall on their faces before Him, pray to Him and then trust in Him. He takes them up by the hand and shows His wonderful works to deliver them from misfortunes. Thus also was Jesus delivered when all earthly assistance failed, because he passed a whole night in praying to his Lord. God listened to his humble prayers and baffled the wicked intentions of the Jews who, on seeing him fastened to the cross, scoffed at him, saying: "He trusted in God, let Him deliver him now" (Matt. 27 : 43). But their triumph was no more than a dream and God delivered His holy prophet from their hands as He delivered Moses before Him and the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, after him.

To be continued.

A PROPOSAL

FOR THE

UTTER EXTINCTION OF JEHAD.

THE Coronation of the King-Emperor in India is an occasion of great rejoicing, and it behoves all faithful and loyal subjects who live under the peaceful and benign rule of the British Government to partake in the joy, and give expression to their sincerity and good wishes for this Government in a manner befitting this auspicious occasion. To me, who lead a retired life and witness even in this life the unseen world which to most other people shall be revealed after death, and who am endowed with a clear knowledge and insight generative of the love of justice and truth, it seems meet to express with sincerity and earnest zeal and in clear and unequivocal words, ideas which reign supreme in my mind and whose expression I deem as my first and bounden duty. With a heartfelt gratitude, I and my followers, whose number is now estimated at more than a hundred and fifty thousand scattered throughout this vast empire, pray for the welfare of His Most Gracious Majesty, King Edward VII. May the all-powerful God whose unbounded power controls every atom of the universe protect His Majesty from every evil and distress and make him victorious over his enemies! May He so guide us that we may ever stand loyally and faithfully by His Majesty's side and be his sincere well-wishers on all occasions!

Twenty-two years ago I published a proposal in my work entitled the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya for the consideration of the Muslim theologians but no attention was paid to it. Since then I have written more than thirty times upon the same theme in different publications of mine but no response has come forth to my call. The approach of the auspicious occasion of the Coronation inspires me with new hope and brings with it new expectations of the fulfilment of an object which I have so dearly cherished since the

very commencement of my career as an author. The proposal is in connection with the relations between the Government and its subjects.

Over half a century has passed since the advent of the British in the Punjab and from this long experience we can say that the British Government is an invaluable blessing to the people of this country in general, and to the Muhammadans in particular. Under its peaceful rule the Muhammadans have made a great advance in learning. Their honour, property and lives are safe under its protection, and peace has been established in the country in such a manner that we can hardly conceive any improvement upon it. But what have our theologians done in return for the deep debt of gratitude which they owe to this beneficent rule? In spite of its innumerable blessings and favors upon the Muhammadans, the Government is so often involved in difficulties on account of the savage frontier tribes who profess the religion of Islam, and the duty lies upon the Muhammadan theologians of this country to take active measures for uprooting this evil as soon as possible. The cause of these difficulties is plain enough and known to all. The mischief is caused by the frontier *Mullas* who are constantly representing *Jehad* with the unbelievers as the first duty of all true Muhammadans and as the key of paradise. Nothing but the united efforts of the *Maulvis* and the *Muftis* can bring to naught the evil which has thus been produced by the *Mullas*, for as the originators of the evil are the Muhammadan theologians, they must also be its destroyers. Our theologians can not assert with any show of reason that they are unable to counteract the evil which has been brought into existence by some of their own body. Even if their efforts are not immediately successful, they are sure at least to lessen the evil by degrees and make it extinct at last. The Government has, no doubt, power to punish the evil-doers and subjugate them by force, but such a measure would involve a heavy loss of life while the desired object can be attained by more peaceful means.

These means consist in the publication of a book attested with the seals and signatures of the leading Muhammadan theologians of the whole of India and containing a clear, full and detailed

exposition of the doctrine of *Jehad*. In this volume it should be clearly set forth that the Holy Quran and the authentic traditions declare it to be strictly illegal to carry on *Jehad* with such a Government as this, which really supports the cause of Islam by the admirable principles of the love of justice and truth which it holds, and the numerous measures which it has adopted for the welfare of its subjects. It may also be shown therein that in comparison with the rule of the Muhammadan monarchs of India, the Muhammadans are far more advanced in learning and enjoy a far greater security and liberty under the peaceful laws of the British Government which are, as it appears on a deeper consideration, clearing the way of the obstacles that have hitherto hindered the spread and progress of Islam. With these clear and forcible arguments it would not be difficult to convince any sensible person of the reasonableness of the views contained in the proposed volume and of the illegality of opposition or disobedience to this Government. The book when prepared should be translated into the Pushto, Persian and Arabic languages and circulated vastly in this country as well as among the frontier tribes. For the defrayal of the expenses of its publication, I am willing to contribute a sum to the amount of Rs. 10,000. It should, however, be borne in mind that brief and ambiguous statements on the doctrine of *Jehad* are of no value. What I lay stress upon is the publication of a book containing a forcible and unequivocal refutation of the principles of *Jehad*. Statements proceeding from the heart are attended with a force and vigour not to be found in the lame and impotent words uttered by hypocritical lips. It cannot be expected that a book which is the outcome of hypocrisy should be given a cordial reception by the public or should effect in a considerable degree the object with which it is written. But the word of sincerity is never wasted, it proceeds from the heart and makes an impression upon the heart. The statements contained in the book should moreover not be brief and obscure. Evidence should be produced from three sources, the Quran, the traditions and reason.

The necessity for writing such a detailed book in refutation of the doctrine of *Jehad* is the greater at the present moment in order to counteract the poisonous effect of a book said to have

been written only recently by the ruler of a neighbouring frontier state upholding this doctrine and exciting people to undertake *Jehad*. And I beg to add that the Government need not have any hesitation in issuing directions to the learned theologians for writing such a book, on the ground that such a step on its part will savour of compulsion. There is no compulsion in a matter which is tacitly admitted by all the Muhammadan theologians, though no active step has been hitherto taken. The measure is, moreover, calculated to be beneficial to the public and productive of greater peace and security in the country, and any action that the Government takes on this point will be far from being considered a compulsion. So long as the doctrine of *Jehad* is not uprooted, the Muhammadans cannot prosper. So long as they stick to it, they are being dragged down into the depths of degradation and contracting habits of bestiality. Moreover, the theologians have no reason to shrink from carrying the proposal into effect. They are not to bear any part of the expenditure. They have only to write out a refutation of the doctrine and to attest it with their seals and signatures. The refutation must, however, be characterized by clearness and lucidity, and sincerity of purpose should be the sole motive leading to it. In drawing attention to this particular point and laying stress upon it, I should not be suspected of doubting the honesty of those who shall be engaged in the task. It is my strong conviction that no good can come out of ambiguous statements. Unless the writers deal with the subject in a lucid and clear manner and take it up with a heart full of zeal, the required object cannot be attained. The root must first be struck off from which grows the doctrine of *Jehad*, and the bloody expectations of its enforcement at any future time must be wholly swept off to ensure success in the undertaking. To abolish *Jehad*, the doctrine must first be disowned which is the central idea in it and whose poison corrupts the whole system.

After giving a deep consideration to this subject, I have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of *Jehad* is rooted in the following two beliefs to which the Muhammadans generally adhere. Firstly, it is held that the time is at hand when the world shall witness the appearance of a *Mahdi* who shall resort to *Jehad* and

religious wars and fill the earth with the blood of unbelievers. Secondly, it is believed that a Messiah shall descend from heaven to assist the Mahdi in his bloody undertaking and spread Islam with his sword like a stern warrior. These two beliefs are the chief support of the doctrine of *Jehad*. One who believes in the advent of a bloody Mahdi and a warlike Messiah must necessarily believe in *Jehad*. Such has been the stern belief of Muhammadans for some time past, but I witness a great change coming over these two religious ideas of late. Even those who fondly held to these doctrines somewhile ago are now realizing the error of their position and many hearts are being expurgated of these dangerous principles. There were blind zealots among Muhammadans who fondly cherished such beliefs and even now we see ignorant people who stick to these false ideas, but in doing so they forsake the Holy Quran, for the sacred book lends no support to their extravagances. The Holy Quran no doubt refers to the appearance of a Messiah from among the Muhammadans in the *Fatiha* and the Light and elsewhere too, but there it plainly states by drawing an analogy between the systems of Moses and Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon them, that as the Mosaic line of prophets came to an end with a prophet who did not resort to *Jehad* or the sword but attracted people to the truth by the force of his moral teachings, so shall it happen in the Muhammadan system, *viz.*, that after the lapse of a period from the founder of the system similar to the distance of time between Moses and his last successor, in other words, in the fourteenth century after the flight of the Holy Prophet, there shall appear among the Muhammadans one who, like Jesus Christ, shall not resort to *Jehad* or the sword but shall draw the hearts of people to God with peace and good-will. It further appears from the Holy Quran that the last Messiah who shall preach the Word of God after the manner of the first Messiah, shall be born at the end of the sixth thousand from Adam. These are the prophecies in the Holy Quran with regard to the advent of a Messiah, and they lay down in clear words that in the fourteenth century of Hegira, Islam shall rely for its progress solely upon moral force, reason and heavenly signs, as did the religion of Moses at the appearance of Jesus Christ. The appearance of a Messiah from among the Muhammadans is

sometimes described as the second advent of Jesus Christon account of the very close resemblance between the two and their spiritual identity. This is the real prophecy and all besides is legend and fiction. The traditions which relate the advent of a bloody Mahdi are the fabrications of later ages. The Holy Quran speaks only of the two Messiahs, the Israelite Messiah and the Muhammadan Messiah, and of the latter it is said that he too, like his great predecessor, the Israelite Messiah, shall spread religion by the moral teachings which he shall inculcate and by heavenly signs. Moses and Joshua and other prophets in the Mosaic system were obliged to undertake wars and their religion was, therefore, considered as a militant faith. But Almighty God cleared the religion of Moses of this false charge by terminating the Mosaic system with Jesus Christ who preached peace and good-will to men. Exactly the same circumstances existed in the case of the system of religion founded by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. In the beginning, self-defence had rendered it necessary to take up arms against opponents who exerted themselves to their utmost to blot out the new religion by force, but afterwards when the circumstances were lost sight of under which Islam had to make a struggle for its existence, the objection was levelled at it of having spread itself by compulsion, though the Holy Quran contained the plain injunction لا اكراه في الدين, *i.e.*, "There should be no compulsion in religion." But as the objection became firmly rooted against Islam, and ignorant and savage Muhammadans gave additional weight to it by their murderous conduct representing *Ghaziism* as the true sign of piety and the sword as a safe guide to heaven, Almighty God removed the error imputed to Islam, in the fourteenth century of Hegira, in the same manner as He removed a similar error from the religion of the Jews by sending Jesus Christ fourteen centuries after the founder of the system. This is the only reality under the extravagant ideas that are now held by the Muhammadans with regard to the advent of a Mahdi and a Messiah.

The time has come when Islam shall be purged of this error and all thinking and intelligent minds shall realize the truth. I say it from experience and the hundred and fifty thousand men

who have accepted my teachings are living witnesses to the truth of my statements. I see the false ideas gradually disappearing and pure truths finding acceptance in their place. Although there are among my followers many men of high education and others holding respectable government posts, yet there are not a few *Ulama* (theologians) who have accepted my views. In convincing them of the falsity of their former views, I had not to toil much, and I found them quite ready to bid good-bye to their long cherished views. From their ready acceptance of my views, I conclude that all intelligent Muhammadans are beginning to conceive hatred for the doctrine of *Jehad*. They are gradually realizing that Almighty God is very kind to His creatures, and brings home the truth to weak human beings with mildness and compassion. No one can doubt that the sword conquers the body only but moral teachings which are not theoretical maxims but practical ordinances, conquer the heart. The ignorant men who have hidden the beautiful and sublime teachings of the Holy Quran which teach the golden mean and are free from every error, beneath the dark cloud of savage war and cruel bloodshed, are guilty of the most heinous crime. As in doing it they acted against the will of God, their efforts to make Islam successful by force of arms have all proved a failure and only brought disgrace on their own head. I have not the least hesitation in declaring that in now resorting to *Jehad* they go against the will of God and their attempts must surely fail. If they fight with God, God shall fight with them for He is now determined to bring about in the world a transformation to purity of life by heavenly signs and the excellency of moral teachings. It is His will now to manifest this grand miracle of bringing about a transformation by peaceful means, and whoever sets himself against His will and resorts to the sword for the propagation of Islam, shall never prosper, for he undertakes to falsify the miracle of God and therefore makes Him his enemy. Whoever shall take up the sword now under the pretence of religion and the cloak of piety, whether he styles himself the *Mahdi* or a *Mulla*, shall meet with sure disgrace for he opposes the eternal decree of God. I think there are hundreds of thousands of Muhammadans who have grasped the reality and millions who are ready to receive it.

The plan suggested here needs the assistance of the Govern-

ment for its completion. If it is acceptable to the Government, it may publish this request of mine and direct the *Maulvies* and the *Mufties* who reject the doctrine of *Jehad* and are willing to set their signatures and seals to the proposed volume on its prohibition, to send in information of their intention up to a fixed date, say the end of June 1903, to an officer appointed in this behalf by the Government. After ascertaining the number of theologians who are willing to co-operate, the Government may issue orders that they should write out their views in the form of a book and send it to the proper officer within a limited time, which should not be less than a year so that the writers may be able to express their views at full length. The Government may then select the book which contains the most powerful exposition and the most forcible refutation of the doctrine of *Jehad*, and getting it translated into Pushto, Persian and Arabic, and signed and sealed by the *Maulvies* and the *Muftis*, circulate it in all Muhammadan countries. If the Government is willing to take this trouble and issue a notification for the preparation of such a work, it is expected that the result would be highly beneficial. I think there is no better plan to bring the savage tribes to a clear understanding of the right doctrine, and the mischief caused by the *Mullas* can only be properly remedied through men of the same profession, *i.e.*, the learned Muhammadan theologians. Experience has shown that the plan suggested shall prove an effective remedy and the Government will do well to avail itself of it.

I need not here dwell upon the numerous blessings and benefits of this Government upon the Muhammadans which call for an immediate active measure on their part to put a stop to the trouble caused to this benign Government by their ignorant co-religionists. If the Government were to withdraw its shelter from this country, there would be anarchy in the land, and nation rising against nation there would be war and bloodshed instead of peace and prosperity.

It is one of the greatest blessings of God upon the people that they should have a just ruler under whose shelter they may lead their lives in peace and security. That a monarch professes the Muhammadan religion is no consolation to a people whose property

and lives are not safe under his rule. It is to our good fortune that we have rulers who sit on the judgment seat with their minds quite free from religious prejudice and who are guided in their public capacity only by considerations of justice and equity. This love of justice and freedom from prejudice of the English officials is well illustrated in a case in which I was personally concerned some years ago. I was falsely charged with the abetment of murder. The complainant was Dr. Henry Martyn Clarke of Amritsar. He was deceived by his subordinate Missionaries who considered it no sin to use foul means to involve a religious opponent in trouble. The complaint was lodged in the court of Captain W. Douglas, the District Magistrate, now Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, who patiently tried the case. After a careful consideration of the evidence for prosecution, the Magistrate saw with a clear sight that the evidence was concocted and the charge altogether false, and I was accordingly discharged. People flocked in large numbers to witness the trial, and the ignorant men were under the impression that the complainant being a respectable Christian Missionary and a co-religionist of the Magistrate, the ends of justice would be miscarried. But upon my discharge all men admired the strict adherence of the English to principles of justice. And since I knew the case against me to be a disgraceful falsehood and trusted in God alone for my clearance, my faith in the British Government's love of justice became tenfold on the result of this case. This case does not only illustrate the love of justice of the English officials but also the keen insight with which they grasp the reality. It is in fact the hardest trial through which a Judge must pass that he should be required to decide between two parties, one of whom is a respectable leader of his own religion and holds a respectable position, while the other has not only an alien religion but being the founder of a new sect is under the displeasure of his own people on the one hand and specially watched on the other for the novelty of his doctrines. But an English Magistrate passed safely through this trial and has thus proved himself a standing witness of the love of justice which characterizes the English Government. To turn against such rulers or to entertain the idea of *Jehad* against them, whether at this, or any future moment, must be condemned as the greatest villainy. The instance in which Captain Douglas showed an unequalled fairness and impartiality has been made by me the subject matter of

a volume. There it shall remain as a permanent record of the love of justice of an English official and shall be remembered for hundreds of years afterwards by my followers.

MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD,
Chief of Qadian,
the Promised Messiah.

The discovery of the Chola of Nanak.

It may not be logically correct to style the disclosure of the important facts relating to Nanak's *chola* (cloak) as the discovery of the *chola* itself, yet so great is the misconception that exists about its true nature even in the minds of those who are fully aware of its origin and so immensely important and so utterly subversive of long-cherished theories, are the facts now disclosed that there is hardly any exaggeration in terming the disclosure as an actual discovery of the *chola*.

The *chola* reverently called the *chola sahib* by the Sikhs is kept at Dera Nanak in the Punjab in a sacred building, specially built for the sacred relic. It is a long cloak with short sleeves and is made of brown cotton cloth. It is stated in the Sakhi of the *chola* that upon Nanak's death, the sacred *chola* passed to his first successor Angad, who wore it about his head at the time of his being ordained a Guru and kept it with him throughout his life with great honor and respect. This ceremony was duly gone through by every succeeding Guru until the time of the fifth Guru, Arjan Das. At the time of succession they wore it on their heads and on great occasions sought blessing from it. Now in the days of Arjan Das, a tank was being dug at Amritsar and many zealous Sikhs were engaged in the task. One of them, named Tota Ram, worked so hard and with such zeal that being extremely pleased with him, Arjan Das expressed his readiness to grant him any thing that he asked. Upon this Tota Ram begged of him the *Sukhi Dan*, *i. e.*, the gift which should give him

eternal happiness or the thing by which he should be guided in his religion. Arjan Das knew at once that he was asking for the *chola*, for in the *chola* only was the guidance to the true religion, and said: "Thou hast asked of me my whole property." He then made over the *chola* to Tota Ram. After some time it fell into the hands of Kabli Mal, a descendant of Nanak, and since then it has remained in the hands of his descendants at Dera Nanak in the Gurdaspur district.

The origin of the *chola* is thus described by a tradition related in the Sakhi of Bhai Bala, more commonly known as Angad's Sakhi:—

NANAK AND THE KING OF ARABIA.

Mardana humbly asked the Guru (*i. e.*, Nanak) as to Arabia. The Guru replied that he would take Mardana to that country if he liked. Again the Guru said: "Mardana, how dost thou like the idea of going to Arabia." He replied: "Just as it please you." Then Nanak set off from that place and they both reached Arabia. The king of this country was known as Lajward. The people were in an evil plight on account of his cruelty and oppression. He used to murder every one who went to his country from India. In this adversity they humbly prayed to God and their prayer was accepted on account of their humility. A voice then came to Nanak from heaven, saying: "Nanak, I am well pleased with thee and grant thee a dress." Nanak said. "As it please Thee, O Lord, for Thou art alone and without any partner or rival." Then Nanak prostrated himself and thanked God. A cloak (the *chola*) was then granted him and upon it were written the words of nature in Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Hindi and Sanskrit. Having donned the cloak, the Guru seated himself outside the gate of the city. After seven days there was a general talk among the people that there was a *dervesh* upon whose cloak were written the thirty sections of the Divine Quran. The news was at last brought to the king that outside the city there sat a *dervesh*, wearing a cloak on which were written the thirty sections of the Quran. Upon hearing this, the king sent his Vizier to get the cloak from the *dervesh*. The Vizier accordingly went to Nanak and told him, that he should make over the cloak to him as the King wanted it, and that he shall be punished in case of disobedience. Nanak told him to take off the cloak if it was in his power. The people then ran to him but they could not take off the cloak as it was the gift of God and had been woven by the hands of nature."

The tradition then goes on to relate that the King tried all the means in his power to get the cloak from the *dervesh* but he was not successful.

Excluding some details, the tradition seems in the main to be creditable. The mere fact that it relates the *chola* as having come down from heaven and the words written upon it as having been written by the hand of God, does not throw any discredit upon its truthfulness. The powers of God should not be limited to the small compass of human understanding. Moreover the words of the tradition allow of an other easy interpretation. The words written upon the *chola* may have been revealed to Nanak by God, and in that case they would be spoken of as having come down from heaven, since the Word of God which is revealed to man, really descends from heaven. Such metaphors are common in spiritual language, and that which is revealed by God is regarded as the Work of God Himself. The coming down of the *chola* to Nanak from heaven may be wonderful, but the Works of God shown to His servants, are still more wonderful. God reveals Himself to the man who seeks Him with extraordinary zeal, and the revelation of the face of God consists in the revelation of His wonderful works. Nanak set out in His search and flitted from one country to another like a restless bird and devoted his whole life to this sacred purpose. He was, therefore, rewarded by God with the wonderful signs of His existence and of the truth of the true religion. The *chola* was given to him from heaven as a sign that in the injunctions written upon it was the pleasure of God, and in its directions was the guidance to true salvation. Nanak, therefore, wore the *chola* because it was a sign from heaven of the pleasure of God.

So far as to the history of the *chola* as given in the sacred books of the Sikhs. Tradition described the words written upon it as being words of five different languages, but what these words actually were, was known to none. On account of the high repute and sanctity of the *chola* among the Sikhs, the practice had become common from the very earliest times of offering to it coverings to protect it from wear and tear. These offerings were made even by Rajas and great *Raises* who worshipped it and sought blessings from it. Some of the most famous men among Sikhs are said to have offered these coverings. As the coverings increased, the *chola* itself became a thing quite unseen. The practice, therefore, became common very early of showing only a very small part of

the sleeve of the *chola* to the worshippers, the rest remaining hidden. The letters over this part became quite obscure on account of being constantly handled and rubbed. Within recent times no one could ever see the *chola*, the credulous and mostly ignorant worshippers being satisfied with a corner.

The words written upon the *chola* which tradition describes to have been written by the hand of God, remained a mystery until very recent times, it being generally supposed that verses from the sacred scriptures of all religions were written upon it. On the 30th September 1895, the Promised Messiah with some of his companions undertook a journey to Dera Nanak to see the *chola* and discover, if possible, the actual words written upon it. The journey ended in a remarkable success. By special arrangements made with the guardians of the *chola*, the three hundred or more coverings, mostly of fine cloth or silk, were taken off and the words which had not been seen for more than three hundred years, were thus revealed. All the coverings were removed one by one and it took the guardians more than an hour to unveil the hidden words of the *chola*. As the last covering was taken off, a startling disclosure was made. There was not a single verse of the Vedas or any other religious book upon it except the Holy Quran. From top to bottom the verses of the Holy Quran, especially those refuting the false doctrines of other faiths with regard to Divine Unity and attributes, were written upon it. The part revealed first of all contained the most well-known verse used in the beginning of the chapters of the Holy Quran, *i.e.*, بسم ا لله ا لرحمن ا لرحيم In the name of God, the most merciful, the most compassionate. Then followed the reputed formula of Muhammadan faith لا ا له ا لا ا لله محمد رسو ل الله Nothing deserves to be worshipped besides God, and Muhammad is the messenger of God. When this revelation was made, the guardians shrank a little from further disclosure but they were prevailed upon by various inducements. Verse after verse of the Holy Quran was then revealed. ا ن ا لد ين عند ا لله ا لا سلا م Verily the true religion with God is the faith of Islam. ا شهد ا ن لا ا له ا لا ا لله و ا شهد ا ن محمد ا عبد ه و رسو له I bear witness that there is no god besides God, and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and His Prophet. قل هو ا لله ا حد ا لله ا لصمد لم يلد و لم يو لد و لم يكن له كفو ا احد Say, God

is one. Everything owes its existence to God but God owes His existence to none, neither does He beget nor is He begotten, and there is none like unto Him. ان الذین یبایعونک انما یبایعون اللہ Verily those who enter into thy *bai'at*, O Prophet, enter into the *bai'at* of God. Besides these, there was the well-known verse known as the throne-verse, as well as the chapter entitled "Help," the chapter entitled *Fatiha*, the names of the Divine Being mentioned in the Holy Quran and several other verses of the Quran, in all of which importance is attached to adherence to the principles of Islam.

Is it an accidental fact that the *chola* of Nanak, the founder of Sikhism, has verses of the Holy Quran written upon it? The whole history of the *chola* belies such a supposition. Nanak wore the *chola* that no one might be deceived as to the religion he professed. The evidence of the unity of God and of the Divine mission of the Holy Prophet, was not only uttered by his lips but was expressed on his very clothes. How could he be best known as a Muhammadan except by wearing a cloak which could not be worn by any but the truest Muhammadan? Wherever he passed he might have been easily known to all as a Muhammadan, and, perhaps, this was the reason that if he set his foot on the ground of a Hindoo, the place was at once purified with cow dung. The asserted origin of the *chola* also corroborates the conclusion that Nanak wore the *chola* as an apparent sign of his being a Muslim. Being a Hindoo by birth, he could not for a moment wear the *chola* unless he believed in its Divine origin and had renounced the faith condemned by the words of the *chola*. The words expressive of his own former state were also there: لا الہ الا انت سبحانک انی کنت من الظلمین, "Holy art thou, O God, there is no god besides thee, I was one of the unjust," thus clearly indicating that from the time that he wore the *chola*, he no more professed his former religion. The *chola*, moreover, affords the only uninterrupted and, therefore, the only sure, testimony of Nanak's religious principles.

In short, there are strong and valid arguments showing that the *chola* which is now kept at Dera Nanak is the very *chola* which Nanak wore as a sign of his Islam. Firstly, it is mentioned in the Janam Sakhi of Angad and Bala which is one of the earliest writings of the Sikh religion. Secondly, there is a book in the hands

of the descendants of Kabli Mal, the guardians of the *chola*, known as the *chola* Sakhi, and in it, it is clearly stated that the *chola* was the gift of God to Nanak, and that his successors all sought blessing from it and honored it. This is a clear proof that the *chola* has ever been regarded as the spiritual gift of Nanak to his successors and as a source of blessings. Thirdly, the *chola* has been honored and respected and even worshipped by the followers of Nanak continually during the four hundred years which have elapsed since it came into existence. Annual fairs and gatherings have also been always held in connection with it, and the coverings that have been offered from time to time by Rajas and Raises are a standing testimony to the honor in which the *chola* has always been held by people of all classes among the followers of Nanak. Although there are numerous other evidences showing clearly that Nanak was really a Muhammadan and we shall produce some of them in the subsequent issues of the Magazine, yet the evidence afforded by the *chola sahib*, is of such a sound and irrefutable character that it alone decides the question of Nanak's religion.

There remains only one question to be answered in connection with the *chola*, *viz.*, is the discovery accidental? We shall be disbelieving in the Word of God if we answer this question in the affirmative. Thirteen centuries ago, the Word of God came upon His servant saying : اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم واتممت عليكم نعمتي and again ليظهره على الدين كله. These two verses referred to two different objects of the life of the HolyProphet of Arabia. The object of his appearance in the world was two-fold; firstly to give a perfect guidance and perfect religion to mankind, and secondly to bring about a reformation in the whole world by spreading the true religion. Now the Word of God in the two verses quoted above clearly referred to two different periods for the completion of these two objects. When mentioning the perfection of the faith and the guidance, the Holy Quran says : اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم واتممت عليكم نعمتي *i. e.*, this day *have* I perfected your religion for you and filled up the measure of my blessings towards you. Thus it clearly expressed that the first object, *viz.*, the perfection of religion, had been accomplished in the Holy Prophet's lifetime. But in reference to the second object, it says : ليظهره على الدين كله and the result shall be

that he shall make it (Islam) victorious over every other faith, *i.e.*, prove its truth and the falsehood of all other religions before the whole world. The form adopted in this case as well as actual facts clearly indicate that this object was not meant to be fulfilled in the first advent of the Holy Prophet. Here the reference is to the future, and the meaning is clear that he shall accomplish this object at some future time and not in his first advent. This indication of the Holy Prophet's second advent appears on other occasions in the Holy Quran, thus, for instance, it is said in the *Sura Juma*, that the Prophet is a teacher of the people among whom he lived as well as of another people who shall came last. In short, the Holy Quran has plainly indicated that of the two objects of teaching a perfect religion and spreading that religion in the whole world in such a manner as to bring about a universal reformation, the one was performed by the Holy Prophet in his first advent and the other shall be completed in his second advent. But the Holy Prophet himself guided his followers as to the true meaning of his second advent, and did not leave them in error, as Jesus did on account of a misconception. He clearly explained that his second advent shall be in the person of one who shall come as his true image and representative, and being wholly lost in him, he shall be as his own self. This promised second advent of the Holy Prophet which from another consideration is described as the advent of the Messiah, was to take place in the last ages for the fulfilment of the second object with which the Holy Prophet had been raised. To bring about the fulfilment of this promise at the appointed time, Almighty God has brought into existence all the means necessary for preaching the Word of God to the whole world.

Exactly in accordance with calculations based on the prophetic word, the Promised one has made his appearance when the whole world was anxiously waiting for his advent, and is doing his duty by pointing out the errors of all religions and proving the truth of pure Islam to the whole world. It is in the fulfilment of this purpose of God that the truth has been revealed about the *chola*. As, on the one hand, a death-blow has been dealt to the Christian error of resurrection and ascension, by the discovery of Jesus' tomb in the Khan Yar Street at Srinagar, the false notion of the Sikhs that Nanak professed any religion other than Islam has been

brought to naught by the discovery of the sacred *chola*. Through centuries of Sikh warfare, the *chola* was preserved to serve as a testimony of the truth of Islam at the appointed time when the sun of its truth was to shine forth in its full effulgence. Had the writing upon the *chola* been known to the fanatical Sikhs who fought desperately against the followers of the Holy Quran, the *chola* could not have survived their fanaticism. But the homage paid to it in the form of coverings combined with the prudence of the guardians in showing to the public only a corner of the dress and the Sikh ignorance as to the Arabic language, became the means of its preservation. It cannot be imagined that the Sikhs who during the ascendancy of their power mercilessly destroyed thousands of lives upon the utterance of a syllable of the Holy Quran, could have worshipped or even allowed to exist the *chola* knowing it to have whole verses and chapters of the Holy Quran written on it, asserting in forcible words the truth of Islam and the absolute falsehood of all other religious principles.

But the *chola* was miraculously preserved so that it may both fulfil the prophetic word in relation to the appearance of the Promised Messiah to accomplish the object of making Islam the predominant religion by strong arguments and heavenly signs, and be a testimony to the truth of Islam by showing that it was from this source that the founder of a great religion received all his blessings. Divine wisdom, therefore, ordained that the writing upon the *chola* should not be known until the appointed time came at which the disclosure was necessary to fulfil the Word of God which had been spoken thirteen centuries before. As the *chola* had a Divine origin and had been worn by Nanak in obedience to the commandment of God, its discovery at this particular moment is also in accordance with the Divine purpose for the regeneration of the world to be brought about through His holy Messenger, the Promised Messiah. The tomb of Jesus Christ at Srinagar and the *chola* of Nanak at Dera Nanak are two of the greatest witnesses to the truth of Islam, and their discovery at the particular moment at which they have been discovered, affords the strongest testimony to the truth of the Promised Messiah who has made his appearance in the fullness of time.

Notes and Comments.

THE EPIPHANY.—Much discussion has been going on in this paper as to the signification of *zanb* and *istighfar*, as given in the May number of the Review. The sense in which these words are used in the Holy Quran is fully explained by their use in the holy book itself. Its religious terms are its own and not borrowed from any other book. In fact the nice distinctions which it has kept in the use of various words have no parallel in any other language, and we are obliged to translate its various words only by the single word *sin* in English. Now, we stated plainly that the word *zanb* was nowhere defined in the Holy Quran as a deed in disobedience to the commandments of God which must be punished. We also stated that the word *jurm* was so defined in many places, for instance, in the verse: ومن يات ربه مجرما فان له جهنم. We then showed that the word *jurm* was never applied to the prophets of God, but that the word *zanb* was in several cases so applied. The fact that the Holy Quran uses a word for the prophets which it does not anywhere define as a punishable deed, and that it refrains from applying to the prophets a word which it has defined as a punishable deed, leads to the necessary conclusion that the Holy Quran does not ascribe a punishable deed to the prophets of God, which is another mode of saying that it never ascribes a sin to any prophet of God. The sinlessness of prophets is thus clearly demonstrated, for it is plain that sin is a deed in disobedience to the commandments of God and must be punishable. The Christian correspondents have in most cases ignored the three points of issue on whose basis the sinlessness of the prophets has thus been demonstrated. Only a few futile attempts have been made but the peurility of their arguments is too evident to be discussed at any length. In refutation of the first proposition that *zanb* is not defined in the Holy Quarn, as a punishable deed, several verses have been produced which speak of punishment for certain persons or people who committed *zanb*. We are sorry for the poor intelligence of the writers if it never occurred to them that this is not sound logic. That certain people who committed *zanb* were punished, does not demonstrate that all who commit *zanb* shall be punished, especially when the Holy Quran ascribes *zanb* to another class of whom it speaks in laudatory terms and whom it describes as the guides of

the world and as true exemplars in whose footsteps all men must walk. In refutation of the second and third propositions that *jurm* has been defined in the Holy Quran as a punishable deed and that it is, nowhere, applied to any prophet of God, the childish assertion has been put forward that the word *jurm* is not applied in the Holy Quran to any person at all. This is due to the Christian ignorance of the Arabic language. If we attribute sin to the person whom we call a sinner, we also attribute *jurm* to the person whom we call a *mujrim*. But the word *mujrim* is frequently used in the Holy Quran though never in regard to any prophet of God. Similarly of the sinners but not of the prophets, the Holy Quran again and again uses the forms *ijram* (to commit *jurm*), *ajramoo* (they committed *jurm*), *tujrimoon* (you commit *jurm*) and similar other forms. Do the Christians still hold that the word *jurm* is not used in the Holy Quran of any one at all?

Some correspondents have adopted a different line of reasoning. They take up some commentaries and enumerate the sins of the prophets as related in them. To attack the Quran and base their objections on commentaries is not an honest mode of carrying on a controversy. They must produce the words of the Quran and give them the interpretation which they can bear. The pity is that they do not hold themselves responsible for the nonsense and rubbish contained in the commentaries of the the Bible and the pages of Christian writers. Those who like to proceed upon this line of reasoning, must first meet the similar objections against Jesus. For instance, his drinking of wine, supporting the cause of intemperance, breaking promises, showing disrespect towards his parents, arrogantly asserting himself to be God, having too familiar connections with women of dubious character, allowing his disciples to eat that which was forbidden to them, destroying the property of an innocent person, abusing the leaders of the Jews, and many other sins related in the pages of the Gospels must first be shown to be compatible with his sinlessness, and then they shall have a right to demand an explanation of the deeds of certain prophets which to them appear objectionable. When solving this question, they should also bear in mind that the Holy Quran does not describe any prophet of God as ever having been cursed by God or forsaken by Him or cast into hell. What was the reason

then that according to the Gospels, Jesus was forsaken by God and cursed by Him, and what was the cause that he went into hell. These points must be cleared in order to determine the question of sinlessness.

THE BANNER OF ISLAM.—This is the name of a new weekly edited by Mr. H. Snow, and its first issue came forth on the 10th of December 1902. Its policy is to leave aside "sectarian quibbles" for the spirit of Islam, and its object is to see "all the sects unified under the spiritual leadership of the Amir-ul-Mominin." The manner in which that object is to be attained is not explained but so far as we can guess from the perusal of the first two numbers, its chief theme is destined to be therapeutics, so commonly practised by men of all persuasions. Certain statements made with regard to Islam in the first number appear to us to be objectionable and injurious rather than beneficial to the cause of Islam in whose interests the paper has been ostensibly started. It says: "We are convinced of the great connection existing between Islam and Primitive Christianity as illustrated by the facts that the *Isha namaz* is in honor of the 5th great Prophet, Jesus, and Islam itself is derived from *Isa-salam* or 'the Peace of Jesus,' the Ruh Allah." We are extremely sorry that such a statement should have appeared in a paper professing to be Muhammadan, but we ascribe it to an ignorance of the Arabic language rather than to an intentional perversion. That *Isha*–عشا has no connection with عیسی *Isa* is only too well-known to all persons who have the slightest acquaintance with the Arabic language. The word عشا existed long before عیسی was born and meant the first part or watch of night and hence in Muslim theology, it came to mean the night prayers. Islam is also a word of very ancient origin derived from the root سلم and means to submit. To connect it with عیسی سلام which is an utterly ungrammatical and un-Arabic construction is simply absurd. In Muhammadan theology, Islam means a complete submission to the will of God so that a person does not speak or move but in obedience to the will of God. Islam is also described as the religion of all the prophets from Adam downwards in the Holy Quran and we cannot understand how عیسی سلام could exist in the case of those who lived thousands of years before عیسی. We hope the "*Banner*

of Islam" will have no hesitation in admitting its error. Another statement which is very derogatory to the dignity of the Holy Prophet and in fact borders upon a denial of his Divine mission, and, therefore, requires to be contradicted, is the following: "Through the Nestorian Church and the Nestorian Monk, Bahera, it produced the Prophet Muhammad himself a Nazarene." We hope the editor would in future take care in expressing such dangerous views.

THE SPIRITUAL DEATH OF CHRISTIANITY.—This is now admitted by the majority of the Christian people. Many books have been written recently by Christian authors in which present Christianity is described as devoid of life and as the Anti-christ. Numerous Christian writers have admitted that the Christian nations excel all nations, past and present, in the three vices of drunkenness, gambling and adultery. Even Church Dignitaries have confessed this in plain words. The *Christian Patriot* of Madras, writes in its issue of 13th December 1902, quoting Revd. T. Walker, M. A.:—

"I have known Tamil Pastors and others resent the statement that true conversions were few and far between; who have yet, when asked in private, confessed that the congregations under their care were carnal, dead and worldly.....There seems so far as I can judge something like a concensus of opinion that *things are far from satisfactory.* I once asked a leading Indian Clergyman how many of the twenty or thirty congregations under his jurisdiction could be said to possess any thing like real spiritual life. He was silent and thoughtful for a moment, and then replied 'Not more than two or three, and I may only speak with certainty of one'.....But is it not a fact that multitudes of those who figure in the statistics of our Missionary reports are Christians in name only? And is it not a fact that many of our congregations are stagnant, dead, lifeless?"

These words coming from the mouth of a Christian Missionary reveal a deplorable condition of spiritual death in the Christian Church. Moreover the signs of true believers given in the Gospels are nowhere met with. All these things concur to prove that Christianity is spiritually dead. What is the reason of this? The disciples of Jesus were not men who could be termed spiritually lost like the present Christian generation. Had Christ been living now, his influence ought to have worked. But it is admitted by the Christians themselves that that influence does not now work. The conclusion is, therefore, evident that Jesus is not now living.

In fact the spiritual death of Christianity is the most important evidence of the death of its founder.

PROGRESS OF THE AHMADIYYA SECT.—The sect has made a wonderful progress during the last three years. In 1898 it numbered only a few hundreds but to-day it counts more than a hundred and fifty thousand. An idea of this progress during the first half of these three years can be had from the Census Reports, though even there the returns are incomplete. The notice announcing the name of the sect was issued after the commencement of the census operations and was not sufficiently circulated among the members living far and wide to enable them to get themselves enumerated as members of the Ahmadiyya sect, and no distinctive apellation had been appropriated before that time. The Bombay Census Report (Census of India, 1901, Vol. IX, Bombay, Part I) alone shows 11,087 persons belonging to the Ahmadiyya sect. It is, however, in the Punjab, the centre of the operations of the Promised Messiah, that the sect is progressing by bounds and strides, and, therefore, the numbers there are far greater. Of this, however, we shall say something later on. The Bombay Census Report contains the following remarks on this sect:—

"The founder of this sect Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Chief of Qadian, has made special efforts to secure the complete return of his followers at this census. He claims to be a Messiah and has described the particular tenets of his sect in a document received at an early stage of the census operations. They can be very briefly summarised as follows:—In the words of the circular 'the characteristic mark of the sect is that it not only repudiates the doctrine of *Jehad* with the sword, but does not even look forward to its enforcement at any future time. Wars undertaken for the propagation of religion it regards as absolutely unlawful.' The founder of the sect then traces a parallel between himself as Messiah or Imam and the founder of Christianity. He claims that his advent was foretold and that he is charged with laying the foundation of peace and good will. After laying down some excellent rules of conduct for his disciples, he explains his reasons for naming the sect "The Ahmdiyya" by referring to the two names of the prophet "the Jalali" name Muhammad, significant of his triumphant career and the "Jamali "name Ahmad, pointing to the peace and tranquility that he was to spread in the world. By denouncing the doctrine of *Jehad* and all crimes of violence committed in the name of religion, the Imam claims that he and his disciples can be fitly document as "Ahmdiyya." The progress of the sect may be followed in the future enumerations and should be a matter of some little interest to the Orthodox Musalmans

of India. It does not appear from the document referred to that any provision has been made for a successor to the founder as Imam on his decease."

This progress is, however, very small in comparison with the vast progress made during the latter half of the last three years. With the general decrease of the population on account of the great number of deaths caused by the plague, there has been a very large increase in the numbers of the Ahmadiyya sect. The acceptance of the teachings of the Promised Messiah has proved the only safe refuge from the violent attacks of the plague and people have run to him in time of distress and thus fulfilled the truth of the words revealed long since, saying يا مسيح الخلق عدوانا thou Messiah who hast been sent as a mercy to mankind, intercede for us with thy Lord."

REVELATIONS.—On the 1st of January 1903 at 5 A. M. (it being the Id day), the Promised Messiah saw in a vision that he was dressed in magnificent robes and his face was shining. The Word of God then came upon him, saying, يبدي لك الرحمان شيئا. اتى امر الله فلا تستعجلوه بشارة تلقاها النبيون "The God of mercy shall manifest a sign to show thy truth. The command of God comes; then hasten it not. These are glad tidings given to the prophets of God." Before this on the 25th of December 1902, Almighty God spoke to him the following words, meant to be spoken by him: انى صادق صادق وسيشهد الله لى "Verily, I am true, I am true, and God shall soon bear witness to my truth." These prophetic revelations clearly foretell of some great heavenly sign which shall show the truth of the Promised Messiah and cause the people to accept and honor him. It shall be a sign from God that his enemies may be ashamed of calling him false and see his truth and acceptance.

On the 2nd of January 1903, the Word of God again came on the Promised Messiah: جاءنى آئل واختارنى واداره اصبعه واشار يعصمك الله من العدا ويسطو بكل من سطا . آئل جبريل هى فرشتہ بشارت دينى والا "An Aail came to me and he chose me and revolved his finger and pointed out: God shall protect thee from thy enemies and attack him who attacks thee. Aail is Gabriel, the angel who brings glad tidings from God."

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] FEBRUARY, 1903. [No. 2.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده و نصلى على رسوله الكريم

An argument for the truth of the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet.

The Holy Quran has asserted in the most emphatical terms that it is the Word of God and that our Lord and Master, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is God's true prophet on whom the Holy Word descended. These assertions are set forth clearly in the following verses of the Quran. الم الله لا اله الا هو الحى القيوم نزل عليك الكتب بالحق (ال عمران) "God is He who has not His equal; He is the source of all life and existence; He has sent His book to thee with truth and truly to satisfy a need." And again, يا ايها الناس قد جاءكم الرسول بالحق "O people, our apostle has come to you when he was truly needed." وبالحق انزلناه وبالحق نزل "At a time of true and long-felt need have We revealed our Word and it has come to you when your (social, moral and spiritual) states stood in urgent need of it." يا ايها الناس قد جاءكم برهان من ربكم وانزلنا اليكم نورا مبينا "O people! this sure argument has come to you and We have sent to you a manifest light." قل يا ايها الناس انى رسول الله اليكم جميعا "O Prophet! say to the people, I have been sent as an apostle to you all." والذين آمنوا وعملوا الصلحت وآمنوا بما نزل على محمد وهو الحق من ربهم كفر عنهم سيئاتهم واصلح بالهم "And as to those who believed and did righteous deeds and believed in the Word that has

been revealed to Muhammad and the same is a true revelation, God shall forgive their sins and better their state." Similar other verses abound in the Quran in which it has been asserted in clear words that the Holy Quran is the Word of God and the Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is His true prophet. This will suffice for the present, but at the same time we challenge the advocates of all other religions to produce in the first place similar emphatic assertions of the truth of the principles they adhere to, from their own revealed books. Particularly we call upon the Aryas to show at least that their four Vedas have even asserted in unfaltering tones that they are the word of God which was revealed to a particular person at a particular time. For, it should be borne in mind, it is the first requirement of a revealed book that it should claim a Divine source for itself and if it hesitates to declare itself so, it is absurd for others to hold or declare it as such.

But the important point to which we wish to draw the reader's attention is that the Quran has not simply claimed a Divine origin for itself and a true heavenly mission for the Prophet Muhammad, but it has also proved that statement with the most strong and cogent arguments, and it is here that all other books with any pretensions to being the revealed Word of God cannot stand the test which the Holy Quran so admirably puts forth and satisfies. Here we would mention only one of the several arguments that the Quran has produced to support its assertions and leave it for the reader to compare the Quran with the religious books of other creeds so far as this argument goes. The opponents of Islam are requested to produce a similar argument bearing upon the truth of their own systems and place it before the public, or if they cannot do this, publish the fact and admit that their books are devoid of such an effective proof. We can declare it with certainty that all other religious systems are wanting in the method of proof we have here stated as being a characteristic of the Holy Quran.

Let us now consider the first argument to which reference has been made above. It will be admitted on all hands that by far the most important indication of the appearance of a revealed book and of a true prophet of God is their need. In other words, they should appear at a time when darkness prevails over the face of the earth,

when the unity of God, righteousness, justice and knowledge vanish away, and idolatry, moral depravity, iniquity and ignorance prevail in their stead, and when a reformer is badly needed. It is also necessary that such a prophet should only depart from the world when he has brought about the desired reformation and established a state of things calculated to promote the moral ideas and welfare of the people, and so long as his work is not finished and transformation has not been brought about, he should be protected from his enemies by the hand of the Almighty. In short, like servants, he should both come and depart as it were under orders. A heavenly mission is established and an apostle raised when circumstances create a necessity for it and time bears witness to the need of one, and he is called back under a prophetic revelation when the plant of reformation is firmly rooted and a mighty revolution has taken place.

So far we have dealt with the argument generally. Now we will show how far it applies particularly to the circumstances under which the Holy Prophet Muhammad appeared and was called back. The Prophet claimed to have been sent for all nations of the earth, and the Holy Quran has condemned all the nations for setting up with God other gods and for corruption and moral depravity. Thus it says: ظهر الفساد فى البر والبحر "The land and the sea have both become corrupt," (gone astray). And again, ليكون للعلمين نذيرا "We have sent thee that thou mayest be a warner to all people that they have been adjudged guilty in the eye of the Lord on account of their false beliefs and demoralization."

It should be borne in mind that the word "warn" used here is a sure indication that the Holy Quran asserted the whole world to be corrupted and to have gone astray from the path of truth and righteousness, since admonition is only for the corrupt and the vicious who are forewarned as to the dangerous consequences of their evil doings. Warning has nothing to do with the righteous, for the prophets of God bring good tidings to the faithful servants of God and warning to the transgressors. When, therefore, a prophet is described as a warner to the whole world, it follows that the Word of God revealed to that prophet declares the whole world to be in a state of moral turpitude.

Such an assertion has neither been made of Moses in the Pentateuch, nor of Jesus in the Gospels, but only of our Holy Prophet in the Quran. In one place we have كنتم على شفا حفرة من النار "Before We sent our apostle to you, you were on the verge of a pit of fire." The Quran also warned the Jews and Christians that they had faithlessly altered the books of God and taken lead in every sort of mischief and vice. It reproached the idolators again and again for worshipping human beings, stones, elements and stars, for misappropriating the properties of orphans, murdering infants, violating the rights of relations and for excesses of every sort. It then says: اعلموا ان الله يحي الارض بعد موتها "Know it for certain that the earth was all dead and God shall now restore it to life." In short, the Quran adjudged the whole world as guilty of setting up false gods, idolatry and transgression, the main springs in which all evils take their rise. It emphatically declared the Jews and the Christians to be the *fons et origo* of the evils of the world and dwelt at length upon their corruptions. The Holy Quran shows that the world then presented a hideous picture which was all darkness and deformity without a speck of beauty.

We have here referred to a very few verses of the Holy Quran bearing on the subject in hand for the sake of brevity. But the Quran almost teems with verses describing most effectively how the whole world had been given to corruption, how the earth had become a dead mass without a spark of life and how the people had reached the very verge of the pit of fire. The Quran repeatedly exhorts the Prophet to warn the world that it had fallen into a seriously dangerous state. Even a cursory glance at the pages of the Quran, would show that the whole world at that time was totally immersed in darkness and stinked with the noxious evils of idolatry, setting up false gods and other transgressions and abominations. The Gospels, no doubt, speak of the mischiefs and transgressions of the Jews but Jesus is nowhere reported to have said that all the people on the face of the earth had become corrupt and morally depraved, nor did he ever claim to be an apostle to all the nations of the earth. The sphere of his actions was limited to a small section of the Jews, nor were his exhortations addressed to any but the inhabitants of a few villages of the Jewish tribe. In bold

contrast with this, the Quran plainly asserts the whole world as involved in ignorance and darkness, the whole earth as dead with every sort of sin, and all the nations as having gone astray. The Jews of the time of Jesus, however deficient in acting upon the precepts of the Old Testament, believed in it inspirations, but when the Quran undertook the work of reformation, it had to correct not only the transgressions of the law but also the false principles and dangerous beliefs then prevalent. Atheism then prevailed in all its force, vast numbers rejected the inspiration and revelations of God, and those who accepted a Creator of the universe were immersed in evils of every sort. The world had gone astray in doctrine and practice alike. Thus while the mission of Jesus was limited to his own small community, and he only enumerated some of the mischiefs of his own tribe, thereby also showing the limits of his purpose, the mission of the Prophet of Islam was directed to the whole world as also appears from the Holy Quran mentioning a general corruption of the whole world. The appearance, therefore, of the Prophet at the time of a universal depravity and general corruption, and his being called back after working a thorough transformation, are, with the additional fact of the Quran itself presenting both sides of this argument and directing attention to it in forcible words, matters which one would in vain turn over the pages of history or revelation to find elsewhere.

It is, we think, hardly necessary to describe in detail the various corruptions and false beliefs of the various nations of the earth; suffice it to say on this point that this statement of the Quran is amply borne out by a perusal of the history of the time. The admission of every people as to their own state, strongly corroborates the statement of the Quran as to the darkness of that age when every nation had given up the worship of the Creator for that of the creatures. It is for this reason that when the Quran declared all nations to have gone astray and to have been morally corrupt, none could clear itself of the guilt. In contrast with their silence and admission take the decided and peremptory words of the Quran which describe the moral death and spiritual lethargy of the people. How expressive is the following injunction: ولا يكونوا كالذين اوتوا الكتاب من قبل فطال

علیہم الامد فقست قلوبہم وکثیر منہم فاسقون اعلموا ان اللہ یحی الارض بعد موتہا قد بینالکم الایات لعلکم تعقلون (الحدید) "The Muslims ought to avoid the course of conduct adopted by the Ahl-i-Kitab. They were entrusted with the Word of God before them, but after the lapse of a period their hearts were hardened and most of them are transgressors and practisers of evil deeds. Know it also that the earth had been dead and God is now again restoring it to life. These are the signs of the need of the Holy Quran and of its truth which We have described that you may understand them." Thus we have stated one part of the argument and shown that the Quran itself brings it forward, and to direct attention to it closes it with the words: قد بینا لکم الایات "It is a sign that the Quran and the Prophet come from God which we have stated that you may think and arrive at the right conclusion."

Now we shall consider the second part of the argument, *viz.*, that the Prophet of God was called back from this world, to his heavenly Master after he had fully performed the business for which he came. The Quran affords ample proof of this and says: الیوم اکملت لکم دینکم واتممت علیکم نعمتی ورضیت لکم الاسلام دینا "This is the day that I have brought your faith to perfection by giving you the perfect Quran and by working a complete transformation in your souls, and completed my blessings upon you and chosen the faith of Islam for you." The purport of this is that the revelation of the Quran was made complete, the holy Word of God effected the most wonderful transformation in capable souls, perfected their training and completed heavenly blessings upon them. Now this verse states in clear and precise language that the Prophet's death did not take place until the faith of Islam had been made consummate by a complete delivery of the Quran and a thorough regeneration of souls. It should also be noticed that it is the companions of the Prophet who are addressed in this verse of the Holy Quran, indicating thereby that the verse did not simply refer to a complete delivery of the Quran but to the thorough transformation of souls that had been effected in the companions and to the completion of the blessings upon them, the mission of the Prophet thus attaining the desired goal. This is, moreover, a criterion of the truth of a heavenly mission and

such success is never granted to a false claimant. Nay, before the time of our Holy Prophet, not even the true prophets attained to the excellence and the height of success which is observable in the case of our Prophet. No instance can be mentioned of any other reformer in whose case the revealed book should have so peacefully been completed on the one hand and a thorough change from iniquity to rectitude effected so successfully and in such large numbers on the other, and in addition to this, unbelief should have so hopelessly been overthrown and Islam so firmly established and so succesfully victorious.

Again, the Quran has in another place, اذا جاء نصر الله والفتح ورايت الناس يدخلون في دين الله افواجا "When the promised help of God and victory came to thee and thou sawest the people enter into the religion of God (*i.e.*, accept the faith of Islam) in vast numbers, praise thou God and sanctify His name and seek His protection, for He comes with mercy upon man." In this verse we are informed that the object which the Prophet of God had in view was attained, *viz.*, people entered into Islam by thousands. The verse in other words refers to the near end of the worldly career of the Prophet, and so it happened, for within one year of this revelation the Prophet died. It also appears from this verse that the Prophet of God had it at heart that he should see the spread of Islam in his life-time, and it was most disagreeable to his feelings that he should have departed before the mission he had brought, had been firmly established. In this verse, therefore, God gives His Prophet the good tidings that He had fulfilled all his desires inasmuch as Islam had taken a firm root in the very life-time of its founder. Every prophet more or less had this object at heart but as they had not the same strong feeling and assiduity, the happy news proffered to our Prophet in these verses was given to none, not even to Moses or Jesus but to one and one only of whom the Quran says: لعلك باخع نفسك الا يكونوا مومنين "Shalt thou kill thyself with the anxiety that these people do not believe."

From all this we see that the clearest proof is afforded of the truth of the Quran and of the mission of the Prophet by the circumstance that the Prophet appeared to fill a need strongly and generally felt by the world and was not recalled from his office until he had firmly

established the truth. At his appearance with his prophetic mission he clearly proved his need to the world and adjudged all the nations guilty of setting up false gods, of wickedness and of transgression. The Quran teems with instances of this. To add one to the list already given, take تبا رک الذی نزل الفرقان علی عبدہ لیکون للعلمین نذیرا "Highly blessed is He who revealed the Quran to His servant that he may warn the whole world and admonish them for their going astray from the right path and adhering to false beliefs." The verse proves by itself that the Quran asserted the appearance of the Prophet to have taken place at a time when all the nations of the earth had become corrupt, and those who were so described by the Word of God set seal to the truth of these words not only by their silence in opposition to such a bold assertion of the Quran but also by their own confessions of guilt. This clearly shows that as the corruption of the world at that time was a general and complete one, so a reformer of equally extraordinary powers was needed to restore the proper order of things. Hence the Prophet appeared at a time when a true and great prophet—the greatest of prophets indeed—was needed and expected. As the argument is without a flaw in respect to the appearance of our Holy Prophet, it is equally sound with respect to his departure. A great many verses of the Quran show that the Prophet went back to his heavenly Master after his teachings had been made perfect and all that was needed in religion had been communicated with care and accuracy. Before his death also the Prophet was informed that assistance from heaven was granted to his faith in all its fullness, and people embraced Islam in large numbers. Verses were also revealed showing that God had strongly impressed faith and righteousness upon their hearts and made them detest all sorts of iniquity and oppression. They were invested with the best and most excellent moral virtues and a radical change marked their lives and their whole course of conduct. Then followed the revelation of the chapter named Victory as a message from the most High that the object of the Prophet's mission was entirely fulfilled and Islam had won the hearts of the people. Upon this the Prophet publicly announced that the chapter hinted at his approaching death. Immediately afterwards he performed the pilgrimage which he called the حجۃ الوداع or the farewell pilgrimage, to Mecca, and on the back of a camel delivered a lengthy speech to the assembled multitude which could

only be counted by thousands. At the close of the speech he addressed the whole audience in the following words: "O people of God! My Lord entrusted me with all these commandments that I may deliver them to you. Do you then bear witness that I have delivered the message of the most High and fulfilled my mission?" The whole multitude replied in one voice: "Yes, verily, you have delivered the message of the Lord to us." Then the Prophet of God looked thrice to heaven each time saying: "O God, I beseech Thee bear Thou witness to this." Again addressing the people he said that the reason of his calling upon them to bear witness to his delivering of the Divine message was that, perhaps, the following year they shall not see him there amongst them. So fully satisfied with the success of his mission and in glory, he left his companions for his eternal journey a few months later at Medina.

Jesus among the ten lost Israelite Tribes in the East, II.

EVIDENCE FROM THE GOSPELS—2.

In the last issue we quoted passages from the Gospels showing that the mission of Jesus was not limited to the very few Israelites living in Judea but that it extended to all the Israelite tribes, the majority of which had settled in the East at an early time. We also showed upon other considerations that Jesus did not meet with his death upon the cross. In this number we shall produce additional testimony from the pages of the Gospels in support of this view.

The story of the crucifixion of Jesus as narrated in the Gospels is one of the most convincing arguments that Jesus did not die upon the cross, and has from the earliest times created doubts in the minds of all sensible persons as to the reality of Jesus' death. No one had ever heard of a person dying upon the cross within three hours and to explain the supposed speedy end, it was thought necessary at an

early time by the advocates of this theory to attribute it to a miracle. So blind is superstition that to support one error it adds another and shuts its eyes when the reality comes before it. The escaping of Jesus with life after a few hours' suspension upon the cross is no matter of wonder. Instances have been cited in which persons who had long been kept fastened to the cross, were restored to life by powerful remedies. The Roman cross did not bring about a speedy death like the modern gallows. It was a very slow and torturing process of putting to death. The body was kept fastened to the cross by means of nails driven into the hands, and sometimes both hands and feet, of the criminal; and it was even possible to recover a person after he had been nailed to the cross for a day or two. Criminals remained on the cross for three days and even more. Food and water were not allowed during this time and the culprit was further exposed to the sun and weather. The body either remained upon the cross to become the prey of birds or was taken down and the bones were broken and thus the last remnants of life departed. But Jesus by the grace of God escaped all these tortures. We learn from the Gospels that he remained nailed to the cross only for about three hours, and this short suspension was, by no means, sufficient to bring about his death. All the circumstances turned to be favorable. It was on a Friday afternoon that the sentence of crucifixion was passed. The following day was the Sabbath and the passover of the Jews who were strictly forbidden to leave any body nailed to the cross on the sacred day. Moreover, like the Muslims they reckoned the night as part of the following day and, therefore, the body of Jesus was to be taken down before sunset. On the other hand, heaven also contributed to the same end. "When the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour." (Mark 15 : 33). The Jews fearing lest they should sin against the Lord by profaning the holy day hastened to take down the body of Jesus, for in the darkness they were unable to ascertain the exact hour of sunset. Happily for Jesus, the soldiers came and broke the legs of the two malefactors but not of Jesus (John 19 : 32).

In this connection Mark. 15 : 44, deserves to be specially noticed. "Pilate marvelled if he (Jesus) were already dead." Our natural inference from this is that even at the moment of Jesus' crucifixion

doubts arose as to his death even in the mind of a man like Pilate who in the performance of his official duties had gained vast practical experience of such deaths and was fully aware of the usual time after which the criminals expired on the cross. Here, therefore, we have the evidence of a man who was in the habit of seeing crucifixions and as an expert his testimony on this point cannot be questioned. He saw clearly that such a short interval of suspension upon the cross could not possibly bring about the death of a man.

Similar evidence is afforded by John 19: 31—34: "The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation that the bodies should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath day (for that Sabbath day was an high day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken and that they might be taken away. Then came the soldiers and brake the legs of the first and of the other which was crucified with him, but when they came to Jesus and saw that he was dead already, they broke not his legs. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side and forthwith came there out blood and water." These verses clearly show that to put an end to a person's life by crucifixion, it was necessary that the bones should be broken. The essential process of breaking the bones was, however, intentionally omitted in the case of Jesus who like the two malefactors was undoubtedly taken off the cross alive. The fact that blood rushed out on his side being pierced with the spear corroborates the statement that until that time he was alive, for otherwise the circulation of blood should have stopped. It seems that some hidden conspiracy had been at work. Pilate was a good-natured and God-fearing man. He was inclined to act leniently towards Jesus but did not take any such action openly for fear of incurring the displeasure of the Cæsar, as the Jews accused Jesus of being a rebel to the Government. Even at the trial Pilate had stated that he saw no fault in Jesus. He, therefore, tried all possible means with the Jews to release him, but they cried out saying: "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." (John 19: 12). Pilate therefore, was unable to show any favor to Jesus openly. On the one hand, his consciousness of Jesus' innocence, strengthened by the dream of his wife which he spoke ruin to him in case Jesus died on the cross,

had made him firm in his resolution of saving Jesus. The fear of the Jews, on the other, who were ready to complain to Cæsar, compelled him to pass the sentence of the accursed death upon Jesus. But he showed extraordinary ability in solving the difficulty. His first plan was to delay the crucifixion till Friday evening. He was well aware that only two or three hour's suspension upon the cross would bring the Sabbath night on which the Jews were forbidden to allow any body to remain on the cross. The circumstances were all favorable to his plan for saving the life of Jesus. The body was taken down before sunset. Pilate further managed to instruct the soldiers not to break the bones of Jesus which if allowed should have put an end to his life. To effect this purpose a pretence was advanced that Jesus was already dead. But we can easily see that when the two malefactors who were crucified at the same time with Jesus and were taken off the cross along with him, were still alive, it was not possible that Jesus alone should have died. The fact is that crucifixion was not a direct means of bringing about death. Either the bodies were taken off the cross alive and their bones subsequently broken, or death was produced by spasms, exhaustion and hunger caused by long intervals of suspension, extending to several days sometimes, upon the cross. Neither of these two processes was adopted in the case of Jesus, although the two malefactors were subjected to the former. It is thus clear that the report of Jesus' death was only made with the object of removing all suspicions from the minds of the Jews.

All went on smoothly up to this time but now there was the further difficulty of finding out the proper person to take charge of Jesus at this critical moment. It is plain that the body of Jesus was not, like the bodies of the culprits, laid in the place of infamy set apart for the purpose, but the Jews would not consent to make it over to his disciples. Joseph of Arimathæa, a respectable and wealthy nobleman in that neighbourhood who was himself a secret disciple of Jesus, arrived in time and with the permission of Pilate took charge of the apparently dead body of Jesus. It seems that the selection of Joseph for this delicate task was also an outcome of the ingenuity of Pilate. Joseph was a respectable chief of a Jewish village and Pilate knew that the Jews would not interfere with him. Joseph found that Jesus who had been given out as dead was only in a state of senselessness. He

accordingly applied strong scents and remedies to restore Jesus to his senses and laid him in a large new sepulchre in a garden close by. This sepulchre had been built according to the usage of the time and had on one side of it a large opening for the free access of air. It was situated in a quarter which the Jews seldom restored to.

All these events happened fourteen centuries after Moses. Now, Jesus was a reformer of that century and his appearance was a sign for the revival of the Israelite Law. There is no doubt that the appearance of their Promised Messiah in that very century had been anxiously waited for by the Jews and the testimony of the prophets also fixed that very age as the time of his appearance, but the Jewish priests, on account of the wickedness of their hearts, failed to recognise the Reformer, and declared him to be a false prophet and a pretender. They pronounced him a heretic and a rebel deserving of death. They persecuted and tortured him and at last brought him to law for alleged malcontentedness. And here there is such a striking parallel that we cannot help drawing the reader's attention to it. In the 14th century after Muhammad (peace be upon him), the same hardness of heart and the same spiritual death may again be witnessed. Now both these stages in the history of religion are also marked by the appearance of a claimant to Messiahship. The claims are in both cases based on true inspiration from God. In both cases the priests pronounce the claimant to be a heretic. Both are announced by the priests as deserving of death, and both are prosecuted in Courts of Law, the one before a Roman Judge and the other before a British Magistrate. The priests in both cases fail to effect their evil designs and the providence of God saves His chosen servants.

Further incidents related in the Gospels as having happened after the crucifixion uphold the view that Jesus did not die upon the cross. The interview that took place between Mary and Jesus after he had left the sepulchre is thus related in John 20: 14, 15: "And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him....." It is plain from this that Jesus had so disguised himself that he could not be recognised even by his

intimate friends. If he intended to rise up to heaven, we cannot understand his disguising himself as a gardener. It appears that to escape detection he put on the clothes of a gardener as soon as he was able to walk, lest the Jews knowing him to have escaped death should again put him into trouble. A God disguising himself as a gardener when his intention was to rise in glory to heaven, is quite incomprehensible. From our ordinary experience in the world, we can reconcile the disguise of Jesus with his intention to flee from that country unnoticed by his enemies, but a God putting on the disguise of a poor gardener and going to Galilee in all hurry to make his ascent to heaven, can hardly be imagined. The truth is, and the writers of the Gospels could not conceal it, that Jesus had disguised himself to escape being discovered and this was the reason that he could not be recognized either by Mary or by the two disciples who walked with him a long distance, and his object was to leave the country unnoticed in disguise and address himself to the other Israelite tribes.

The Gospels afford ample proof that it was not with a celestial body but the same body of flesh which had been fastened to the cross that he appeared to his disciples after his supposed death. Thus we read that on his way to Galilee after leaving the sepulchre, Jesus was espied by certain persons. He also appeared to the eleven (disciples) as they sat at meat. (Mark 16: 9, 14). And when they saw him, they supposed that they had seen a spirit, but he showed them his hands and feet and asked them to handle him, saying: "A spirit hath not bones and flesh as ye see me have." And then he took from them a piece of a boiled fish, and of an honey-comb and ate it before them. (Luke 24: 39—43). These verses prove irrefutably that Jesus did not rise to heaven but went to Galilee after recovering his senses and that like all mortals he had a body of flesh and was dressed in ordinary clothes. Had he risen after actual death, it was not possible that the wounds of the nails should have been apparent on his body. Still more wonderful is the fact that he partook of food—an idea altogether inconsistent with a life after death and a celestial body. And if we may suppose that a celestial body can feel hunger and thirst and Jesus had need of food then, that need must still be present on the heavens where he is sitting on the right hand of his father.

Jesus' going to Galilee is a further evidence in the same direction. He appeared first to Mary Magdalene who told the disciples what had happened. But they believed not when they heard that Jesus was alive and had been seen of her. After that he appeared to two of them as they walked and went into the country. At last he met the eleven as they sat at meat and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart (Mark 16 : 9—14). Again in Luke 24 : 13—31 we read that when two of the disciples were going to Emmaus, a village about three score furlongs from Jerusalem, Jesus himself walked with them in disguise. When they drew nigh to the village, Jesus walked on as if intending to go further on but they constrained him and requested him to abide with them that night. So he went in and tarried with them and sat at meat with them and partook of the food. It is evident that the acts which Jesus did, as for instance eating, drinking, sleeping, holding conversation and taking a long journey to Galilee—a distance of about seventy miles from Jerusalem, are all the concomitants of an earthly body and that, therefore, it was with such a body and not with a celestial one that Jesus did all these things. It is simply absurd to hold that the movements, the failings and the requirements of a mortal body attached to a celestial one. Although prejudice or the one-sidedness of the writers has effected much change in such narratives of the Gospels, what remains is still sufficient to prove beyond doubt that it was with the ordinary mortal body that Jesus appeared to the disciples, showed them his wounds, partook of meal, slept with them and travelled on foot the long distance between Jerusalem and Galilee.

The journey to Galilee is quite inexplicable if Jesus intended to rise to heaven, for it can hardly be assumed that Galilee was a station where tickets were available for an upward journey. Neither did Jesus make any public show of his ascension at Galilee though he had less fear of the Jews there. His going to Galilee gives rise to the only sensible conclusion that thence he continued his journey to some other country. We will show upon other considerations later on that he went to the abode of the Eastern Jews who had welcomed him at his birth. If his intention was to rise to heaven from the very beginning,

his first step ought to have been taken in the direction of heaven and not in a quite different direction by pursuing which he could have only reached some other country and not heaven. Even if immediate access to heaven was not allowed to him, he could have waited for three or forty days as he liked, over Jerusalem midway between heaven and earth, and thus even the Jews would have seen this miracle and believed in him and repented of their evil deeds. This would have been quite consistent with his alleged rise to heaven. But travelling a long distance of seventy miles on foot, walking day and night, and disguising himself as a gardener instead of assuming any glorious appearance, throw much discredit upon his alleged ascension to heaven and support the only true conclusion that he left that country in disguise for some other place. We will further on show that he applied an ointment to his wounds which cured them in a very short time.

This point deserves the reader's deepest consideration. Let him pause for a moment and think if it could be possible that after getting a celestial and immortal body which should have been free from all human failings and not subject to pains and troubles, Jesus could still have travelled like an ordinary mortal and when tried by the journey taken rest in a village, felt hunger and thirst and partaken of food, and applied an ointment to his wounds to assuage the pain which he felt. That celestial body which should have been eternally safe, unchangeable and free from faults, had still all the mortal failings in it! Not only did Jesus show his flesh and bones to those who took him for a spirit and not an actual living human being, but he dispelled all their doubts by showing that he felt hunger and thirst and, therefore, ate and drank with them, and that he felt tired and, therefore, took rest with them after a long journey on foot. There is not the least doubt that in this world hunger and thirst are pains the excess of which is sure to cause the death of a person. From this it naturally follows that Jesus did not die on the cross, but having been reduced to a state of senselessness on account of the excess of pain, he was taken charge of by a person who lavished care upon him and applied all sorts of remedies to bring him back to his senses.

The sepulchre in which Jesus was placed after being taken down

from the cross affords the further evidence that it was not meant for a dead body but for a living person. In fact it was not a grave but a large ventilated room hewn in the side of a rock. Consider the manner in which the laying in of Jesus in the sepulchre and his coming out therefrom are described. "And he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre" (Matt. 27: 60). "Upon the first day of the week very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." (Luke 24: 1—3). Now, in the first place Jesus was not buried as dead bodies are generally buried. Only a large stone was rolled to the door of the sepulchre which shows clearly that openings for the free access of light and air were left intentionally. It is also seated that the women went into the sepulchre and found two men seated inside. From this it appears that the sepulchre was so spacious as to afford room for six or seven persons at the same time. Such a place can hardly be called a grave which has no more space than is required for the laying in of a single body. The sepulchre had moreover a door which was closed in a manner which rendered communication between Jesus and his friends very easy. The coming of the women on the third day with spices and ointments also supports the assertion that Jesus was actually alive and was known to his intimate friends to be so. We can hardly imagine the friends of a deceased person bringing ointments to anoint the corpse on the third day after it had been buried. We cannot even think of a corpse being visited which had been laid in dust for three days and, therefore, become putrid on account of decay. Lastly it must be noticed that on the third day when the women came to see Jesus, they found the stone rolled away. Had Jesus come out with a celestial body and not a body of flesh and bones like ordinary mortals, why should the stone have been rolled away? And if even after his supposed resurrection Jesus was unable to come out of the sepulchre without the stone being rolled away from its door and his body was a hindrance to his coming out through a small aperture or through the stone itself, it is beyond dispute that he could not have risen to heaven with the same body, while the Gospels repudiate the

assertion of any change of body after the alleged resurrection.

Another important point deserves to be mentioned in connection with the disguise put on by Jesus. Notwithstanding disguise he was still afraid of the Jews, and did not like that any body except his disciples and intimate friends should know the fact that he was alive. When the women went to the sepulchre, a person informed them that Jesus was alive and on his way to Galilee and told them to inform the disciples of this. On receiving this news the women were afraid. Now there was no ground for being afraid except that they feared lest the Jews should seize him again. But Jesus met them and said to them, "Be not afraid," *i. e.*, of his arrest "go, tell my brethren that they go into Galilee and there they shall see me." (Matt. 28: 7—10). It was very wise on his part not to lengthen his stay in Jerusalem, where the rumour of his being alive reaching the Jews, he would have been laid hands upon again. He was so cautious that he did not wait to see his disciples, and thought it more advisable to keep the matter secret by travelling alone and in disguise than join his friends and disciples where the suspicions of his enemies would have at once discovered him even in disguise. As soon, therefore, as he was able to walk he left the city and sent word to his friends to see him in Galilee which was a safer place for that purpose. Even there the disciples took care to shut the doors when they were alone with Jesus, lest his enemies should get any information of his flight. Of course it is easy to see that all these precautions were simply absurd if Jesus possessed a celestial body. Why did he fear to make himself known at Jerusalum even to his friends? The reason is evident that he feared that the rumour might get abroad of his being alive if he revealed himself in the centre of Jewish activity, where public excitement was at its height against him.

Here then we have the story of a man who remained on the cross for the very short duration of three hours, there being not a single instance in history in which death had been brought about in such a short interval, whose bones were not broken, from whose side when pierced a little, blood flowed, regarding whom no medical evidence was procured that he was actually dead, whose body was not laid with the bodies of other culprits but was taken charge of by a wealthy

disciple who lavished all sorts of care upon him and applied all remedies, who instead of being buried in a grave was kept in a large ventilated room whose door was temporarily closed by a stone, whom friends and acquaintances came to see the third day, who came out of the sepulchre by the stone being rolled away, who immediately disguised himself as a gardener, who did not allow his friends and disciples to see him in the place where there was danger of his being seized again, who fled away from the scene of excitement as soon as he was able to walk, who walked the long distance of seventy miles, who was tired by the journey and took rest, who felt hunger and thirst and asked his friends to give him food, who ate and drank like ordinary mortals, who showed the wounds of the nails on his body to his friends, and who kept himself hidden and in disguise all along. No sensible person would think that this person was the all-powerful God making preparations to rise to heaven. The facts of the story lead to one and only one conclusion that Jesus did not die upon the cross because the short time during which he remained suspended on the cross was not sufficient to bring about the death of a person; that nothing happened to him afterwards which could bring about his death; that having recovered after one day and two nights, he managed to disguise himself and fly from the country alone and unnoticed; that he had the same body of flesh and bones and the same requirements and failings after coming out of the supposed sepulchre as he had before; and that he sought protection in some other land from the cruelties of his countrymen. Such is the story of Jesus and no sensible person will doubt that he was alive when taken down from the cross and that he subsequently fled to some other country.

To be continued.

The Early Life and Mission of the Promised Messiah.

(IN HIS OWN WORDS.)

I have been inspired by God to execute this mission and to invite men to the truth. God has committed to me a message, and has com-

manded me to deliver it to the world. I have taken this work in hand at the bidding of my Master, and it is nothing but doing my duty and paying the debt which I owe to the world.

Let it be known that I claim my descent from noble and respectable ancestors. I have received information from on high that their original home was Samarqand. After their settlement in this country, the reigning monarch, knowing their position and nobility, entrusted them with the command of armies and the government of provinces. In course of time one of my forefathers became the head of an independent state. He and his descendents ruled over it ably and peacefully until the time when the Sikh hordes overran this fair country. The brief term of Sikh ascendency was marked by complete anarchy and bloodshed, and the people were plunged into unspeakable misery. The state of my ancestors could not hold out against the rapacious Sikhs ; they seized upon it and threw the reigning chief into prison. Afterwards they turned him and his family out of house and home. It was winter and the nights were terribly cold. Shivering with cold and utterly prostrate with grief at their sad lot, the sufferers were turned out one dismal stormy night from their fathers' land, and were compelled to seek asylum in a neighbouring state whose ruler was friendly to them. He opened to them his hospitable door and received them as honored guests. At last the measure of Sikh iniquity became full to the brim, and the time came when the plundering career of these marauders was to receive a check. The British came from the East like the rising sun and dispelled the dark clouds of Sikh tyranny. They gave the country not only peace and tranquility but above all religious liberty which to me seems the greatest boon which a just ruler can confer upon a subject people. The victims of Sikh oppression once more breathed freely. The surviving members of our family returned to their native country to share in the general peace and received back a small part of their former state.

Time went on. At last my turn came ; but almost nothing of my ancestral state descended to me and at my father's death I was left quite forlorn. At this period of my life scarcely any body knew me. Even my fellow villagers gave me the cold shoulder and I was forsaken by everybody. But I was quite satisfied with my lot and never showed

signs of discontent. Indeed, I had never at any time in my life sought honor and distinction. I was naturally inclined to lead a retired and an unknown life and never thought of being considered a distinguished member of society. Even in my father's life-time, I never liked to receive visits. Long interviews were always irksome to me and they made me sad and downcast. This disposition in me did not escape the notice of my father. He gave up all hope of me and regarded me as little better than a guest who ate his bread and did nothing for him. Being fully convinced that I was given up to solitude and a life of devotion, and had a fixed aversion to mixing with society, he had great apprehensions of my condition in the world. He urged me to improve my worldly prospects and do something for my material prosperity. Like a kind father, he painted before me worldly greatness in very vivid colors, but in this matter found me quite deaf and blind. For me these pleasures had no attraction because I felt myself irresistably drawn to the source of all enjoyments.

At length the time came when God called away my father. When my father was yet alive and before any fatal symptoms appeared, the Word of God came to me at midday foretelling my father's death after sunset that very day. No sooner the idea of his death passed into my mind than the inspiration of God broke forth upon me in the following words: أ ليس الله بكاف عبده "Is not God sufficient for His servant." My father died after sunset as the Word of God had spoken, and this happened on a Sunday night. It was thus on a Sunday that I passed from the shelter of worldly protectors into the protection of my great Master. As the creation of the world commenced on a Sunday, so God ordained that Sunday should also be the first day of that glorious new world into which I was entering. In memory of this blessed inspiration, I immediately got the words of God engraved on the stone of a ring which I have always kept with me. In accordance with this word which God spoke to me, He took charge of all my affairs, Himself became my teacher, Himself guided my soul in all concerns, Himself supplied me with all I required and Himself crowned me with honor and glory. I was unknown, God made me famous; I was unrecognised, God gave me glory and renown; I was in want, God granted me affluence. This grand prophecy now shines forth like the Meridian sun.

Thus God gave me honor and glory. But I had not the least idea that He would present me before, the world as the Promised Messiah, and through me would fulfil His promise. As for myself I always shunned the path of renown and wanted to be left alone with my meditations. I studiously avoided society and all my enjoyment consisted in living a retired life. But God's command was imperative. He charged me with the duty of inviting men to Him and fulfil His pleasure. I took up that duty like a faithful servant.

I have a friend whose love has pervaded my whole being and has made me averse to worldly greatness.

I see that the land of those who seek the world, is often stricken with famine ; but the land of love never sees dearth.

Most men are drawn to the pleasures of sense, but I am attracted to that beautiful face whose sight gives eterna bliss.

I cleave to my beloved one and this nearness has lighted up the recesses of my heart.

I have vowed a solemn now that I will never quit His side even if lions and wolves may tear me to pieces.

Other people's glory departs with their breath, but the glory which love brings is everlasting.

They abused me and I do not know why ; shall I ever desert my friend and act against his will.

In this way I became wholly God's and cut off all connections with the world and its people, and had very little to do with its concerns. I remember that I was quite young when I felt myself powerfully attracted towards my Lord and there dawned upon me the dim consciousness of a future when God would use me as His instrument in carrying out one of His great plans. I was like gold hidden in dust which was to display its brightness at last. In my youth when my father saw that I was slow in the business of the world and was always devoted to religion, he was much ill at ease and tried his best to persuade me to climb the heights of worldly greatness, and gain wealth like my forefathers. But he little knew that God had another sort of greatness in store for me. He illumined me when the world

was immersed in cimmerian darkness, and made me a beacon of light to give light to the whole world, and by His grace He made me the Promised Messiah. Then He helped me in various ways. He manifested Himself to me and eclipsed the sun and moon to verify my claim. The announcement of my claim to the Promised Messiahship was received by the Maulvies with outbursts of great indignation. They set me up as a liar and branded me with heresy. Had it not been for the fear of the authorities, they would have taken my life. They thought that the Messiah would come down from heaven. I did my best to make them think to the contrary and by reasons and arguments pointed out to them the error of their belief, but they persistently shut their ears against me.

Listen O earth ! and bear witness O heaven ! that I have received inspiration from on high, and have found access to the Divine mysteries. I have been sent in the early part of this century in order that I may restore Islam to its original purity, and as a judge remove the differences that are tearing asunder the Muhammadan sects, and armed with the weapons of heavenly signs, destroy all false principles, and bring about a spiritual transformation in the whole world. I am not an impostor nor am I given to lies. God knows that I am not one of those who lead men into evil and sin. Let every one remember that a liar never prospers but meets a disgraceful and miserable end. My revelations are from God and have all the signs of a Divine revelation. They are repeatedly impressed upon me as being from God and my heart is filled with the conviction that they are Divine. They are always in conformity with the letter and spirit of the Holy Quran. They are accompanied by extraordinary manifestations from heaven and their heavenly origin is confirmed by the heavenly signs which attend them. Therefore they are not delusions but real manifestations of Divine will. Does the world think that it cost me nothing to receive this inestimable blessing? No; I had to undergo the severest hardships. I flung myself into the fire of love and was wholly consumed. My heart bled and I was ground to dust. It was then that He revealed to me His radiant face and I got not only revelation but also true wisdom. Most of the revelations which I receive contain prophecies. Now, the deep secrets of the future are known to none but God, and, therefore, he who foretells the future, must necessarily be from Him.

The wicked who set their affections upon worldly glory can never get access to what is exclusively God's. Can God take into His confidence one who has set the trap of fraud to ensnare His people, who instead of showing men the right path leads them to destruction and injures the cause of truth? It cannot be. God brings the impostor to a bitter end. He invariably and speedily roots him out and sends him to eternal perdition.

It is a Law of God that He always raises a reformer at the time of spiritual and moral decay. Agreeably to this law, He revealed Himself to me that through me He might infuse new life into men dead in spirit. He exalted me to the dignity of Mahdi and Messiah and opened up to me all the treasures of sacred wisdom. He has made me His instrument in bringing falsehood to naught. The reason of the Messiah being styled the Judge (Hakam) is that he shall make his appearance when the Muslim community shall have been split into many and contending sects. The Messiah shall put a stop to all discord by his just and final verdict in all religious questions. In his days no system of belief shall be free from conflict of opinions. But he shall sift truth from error and shall take up the side of truth and declare against error. The cause of his being called the Mahdi (the Guided) is that for his wisdom and knowledge he shall not be indebted to mortals but the Almighty Himself shall be his instructor and guiding star as He was of the Holy Prophet. He shall enjoy personal communion with God and shall be educated in the seminary of heaven. He is entitled the Messiah* because for the propagation of Islam he

* Prophetic writings speak of two Messiahs. One of them is the false Messiah—that pretender to Messiahship whose irruptions shall take place in the last ages of the world. The other shall be the true Messiah who shall also appear in the last ages. The false Messiah shall make use of crooked policies and shall be impure in all his ways and dealings, and shall have recourse to misinterpretation of the Word of God, gross deception, pious fraud and many other base devices, and shall prop up falsehood by base contrivances and shall be called Antichrist. His business shall be the telling of lies and the seduction of people from the right path. But the true Messiah shall place his sole reliance upon God, and taking his eyes off all material aids shall make prayer his only resource, and shall soar heavenward until he shall touch the heaven by means of his trust in God. His work shall be to support the cause of truth and rescue the perishing. The word Messiah مسیح comes from *Masah* مسح (touch) which implies that he shall touch the heavens as well as the earth.

shall not wield weapons, but shall place his sole reliance upon heaven whose blessings he shall call down as if by a miraculous touch and gain his ends through them. The weapon at his command shall be his heartfelt prayer uttered with tearful eyes. The spiritual personality of the Messiah and the Mahdi is a combination of the spiritual personalities of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and Jesus, may peace and the blessings of God be upon them. Some of the phases are derived from the one and some from the other and are thus intermixed to form a complete and uniform whole. In other words, their spirituality pervades his whole being and as it were supplies the fuel which keeps up the heat of his spiritual life. Both these great personages have appeared again through him, and both constitute the key to the secret of his being. Now, one of the untold perfections of the Holy Prophet was that the word revealed to him, could not be equalled in its beauty and excellence by the combined efforts of all mortals. The Promised Messiah in the quality of the Holy Prophet's vicegerent has also inherited that perfection, because being the very image of the Holy Prophet it was impossible that he should not have inherited this heavenly perfection. In the same manner the Promised one has inherited the perfection of Jesus Christ. And as the personality of the Promised Messiah was quite blended with these two personalities and was wholly lost in them, therefore the names of these two chosen ones of God predominated over his own name and on heaven the names of these two great ones were appropriated for him.

ISTIGHFAR.

Many people have stumbled at the true signification of *istighfar* on account of their lack of knowledge of the Arabic language as well as of the true relation between man and God. *Istighfar*, as the very form of the word shows, is a prayer. To see what is asked in the prayer we must go to the root of the word. It is derived from *ghafr*, other infinitive forms being *maghfirat*, *ghufran*, &c. The prmiary and literal meaning of *ghafr* from which all secondary significations are derived, is to cover or protect, as given in all Arabic dictionaries. The primary meaning of *istighfar* is, therefore, the seeking of protection, or

a prayer for protection and support. To whom is the prayer to be addressed and from what is the protection to be sought? As to the first point, it is clear that the term being one of Islamic theology, the prayer could be addressed to none but God, for in Islam all prayers are addressed only to God and to none besides Him. It is further evident that the common form of this prayer is استغفر الله "I seek the protection of God" or "I pray to God for His protection." Thus far, therefore, the conclusion is evident and even the Christians must admit that *istighfar* is a prayer addressed to God for His protection. The most important point that must be settled is, in what respect is the protection sought, *viz.*, is the protection sought simply from the punishment of evil which a man has wrought, or is it sought primarily from the evil itself, and secondarily from its consequences if the evil has been done?

In the first place then, what is the relation of God to His creatures? After creating man God has not left him to himself and alone, He is not only the Creator but also the Supporter. Whatever has been made by the Divine hand is also supported by it. If, therefore, man needed the creating hand of God to come into existence, it is equally true that he needs His supporting hand to be saved from corruption. The Divine attribute of creation required that man should be created in the image of God, and the requirement of the Divine attribute of support was that what had been created in the Divine image, should not be given up to corruption and everlasting destruction. It is to denote these two attributes that the words الحی القیوم are used in Holy Quran, indicating that God brings into existence and supports that which He has created. In fact, it cannot be contested that the existence of man needed two things, a Creator and a Supporter, the one to bring him into existence and the other to preserve him from corruption.

In consonance with this attribute of support in the Divine Being, we witness a want in the nature of man which is the necessary requirement of his being a creature. It is the weakness of his nature, his dependence upon something else. To this the Holy Quran testifies in the verse خلق الانسان ضعیفا *i.e.*, "Man has been created weak." He is a creature and as such he is dependent upon his Creator. He resembles the infant that needs the assistance of its mother in every step.

On the one hand then, we have the attribute of support in God, and on the other, the weakness and dependence of man which requires some support. Now, although Almighty God has provided numerous means for the support of man and given him His gifts in abundance without his asking for them, yet man being an intelligent being, must exercise his own will to avail himself of some of these gifts. Every sensible person perceives the feebleness of his nature, and feels that human nature by itself is powerless to resist the evil tendencies. If he, therefore, does not call to aid the Being which is the source of all strength, he rejects the gift which he could have claimed by asking and leads himself into evil. To this necessity of asking this gift, the Holy Quran refers in the verse إياك نستعين "O God! Of Thee do we seek assistance that Thy support may uphold us against the weakness of flesh and protect us from stumbling and falling." In this verse Almighty God has taught man to pray for the Divine support and protection to make up for the deficiency of his nature. The more a man feels the weakness of his nature, the more he will ask for the Divine strength, and to a greater extent he will consequently be protected from evil.

So far the argument is so clear that we do not think any one admitting the existence of God will seriously call it in question. There is the attribute of support in God and there is the weakness in the nature of man, and there is the necessity that man must ask for the Divine support to overcome the evil. In other words, the man who desires to be protected against evil, must pray to God to grant him His protection and support. This we have already seen is the proper significance of *istighfar* which we have shown as meaning a prayer addressed to Almighty God for His protection and support. Such prayer we have now shown, is necessary for protection from evil. Hence the necessity of *istighfar* for every person without any consideration as to the actual commission of sin by him. Even if sin had no existence in the world, *istighfar* being a requirement of the creation of man, would still have been there. It exists that the building which God's own hand has erected might not be demolished. But such a thing was not possible in the very nature of things without the supporting hand of God. There was a craving in the very nature of man without whose satisfaction he could not have attained to perfection. To satisfy this

he was guided to say *istighfar* and thus make up the deficiency of human nature by imploring the strength of God. The Divine attribute of creation is manifested when a man is brought into existence but the quality of support needs a constant manifestation as it is to continue with the life of man. Hence the necessity of constant *istighfar*.

From the above it will be clear that *istighfar* is primarily needed for protection from the evil itself and that, therefore, the prayer asked for in *istighfar* is primarily in respect of protection and support against the feebleness inherent in human nature. The nature of man and the attributes of God both require that *istighfar* should in the first place be for protection from evil. Other considerations lead to the same conclusion. If the desire of being protected from the punishment of the evil that has been done, is impressed upon the human heart, the desire of being protected from the evil itself is still more so. In fact, the latter desire is permanent and inherent in the nature of man and is the primary consideration of every human being whether he has sinned or not, whereas the former desire takes possession of the heart only upon actual commission of sin. Salvation itself is nothing but a deliverance from the bondage of sin. And since every human being yearns after salvation, it is clear that the first and the primary consideration of all human beings is to be delivered from evil. Nay, the desire to be relieved of the evil consequences of sin cannot come alone. True desire for the pardon of sins never enters the heart unless it has a strong yearning to be protected from the evil itself. There is no true repentance unless the heart hates evil and desires to get rid of it for ever. All this shows the importance of the desire in human heart to be delivered from evil, and proves beyond a shadow of doubt that if *istighfar* were to be limited to only one object, that object must be protection from evil, and that protection from the consequences of evil would only be a secondary object in human heart.

This conclusion is further strengthened upon a consideration of the object with which the prophets are raised. The primary object of their appearance in the world is to deliver men from evil, and not to grant them pardon for the sins which they go on committing. The work done by a prophet can only be judged from the deliverance from

evil which he has effected, and this is the ground upon which their respective merits may be compared. It is for this obvious reason that the Holy Prophet Muhammad has an eminence not reached by any other prophet. He was raised at a time when darkness prevailed on the face of the earth and people had gone astray both in doctrine and practice. The Arabs who were directly addressed by the Holy Prophet had sunk deep in vice and hardly knew the name of morality. Within a short time the Holy Prophet effected a marvellous transformation in their lives and delivered them from every evil in which they were involved. From the depths of degradation he raised them to the highest pinnacles of civilization. The Prophet, therefore effected a palpable deliverance from evil. It is here too that the failure of Jesus is most evident. About him there is the only boast that through him the sins of people were pardoned, but the Gospels do not tell us how many thousands of people he delivered from evil in his life-time. As to the transformation alleged to have been effected after his death in his few followers, we cannot give the story any credit in the face of the fact that he was not able to deliver even his chosen disciples from sin in his life-time. Even the eleven, to say nothing of the twelfth, were guilty of a grave sin in deserting their master at the critical moment.

In short, the great object with which prophets appear, is to deliver people from the bondage of sin and the Holy Quran teems with verses to this effect. And since this object, as is admitted even by the opponents of Islam, cannot be attained except through humble prayers to God to that effect. Who alone can support a man against the power of evil, it would be strange if a prophet, and particularly the prophet who had effected the greatest deliverance of mankind from evil, went away without teaching his people such a prayer. Is the Holy Quran, with its repeated injunctions to men to purify themselves devoid of the means by which such purity can be brought about? Did not the Holy Prophet teach the manner in which deliverance from evil could be obtained notwithstanding that he delivered hundreds of thousands of men from the bondage of sin? If *istighfar* is not that method, both these questions must be answered in the negative, which would be a strange combination of contradictory statements.

All these facts concur to prove that in *istighfar* the primary object is protection against the power of evil. As a prayer it is above all prayers. It is not a prayer for daily bread, but a prayer for the protection and support of God, a prayer for being saved from stumbling or falling, a prayer for perfection, a prayer for the highest Divine blessings. It is the closest form of communion with God, the highest flight of the spirit of man towards the Divine Being. The person who resorts to *istighfar* humiliates himself before God. He sees the weakness of his nature, the dread of the path and the power and glory of his Maker. He does not rest satisfied with his own strength but flies to the protection of the Almighty Being and seeks assistance from Him. His whole delight, his very paradise, is in this that he should fly to that rock of strength, and without His shelter he cannot live. He supplicates God to save him from yielding to the weakness of the flesh, to strengthen the human nature and to take him in His refuge and under His shelter. His own self is annihilated and God is all in all to him. He prays to God that He may protect him from yielding to the frailties of human nature by His Divine power, strengthen him by His strength, lighten him by his celestial light, and instruct and guide him by His Divine instruction. The man who constantly recurs to *istighfar* feels his own dependency and turns to God for help and aid, and thus gives evidence that he has overcome the weakness of flesh and resisted the evil tendency because the strength of God is with him, and His light descending upon him, has suppressed every infirmity of nature which could have led to sin. Being sensible of his weakness, the wise man does not rely upon his own strength but calls the Lord to his aid that he might not slip or slide and has recourse to *istighfar*. The sinless man flies for help and succour to God. He knows it for certain that human nature does not merely as such possess perfection but that it receives perfection from God, that it has not got any strength, but that strength is given to it every moment from above, and that it has no infallible light but that such light comes to it from the Almighty. From among men he only is perfectly sinless who strengthens his soul by drawing the Divine power by means of *istighfar*, and does not cease for a single moment to draw it by his supplications, prayers and cries. The secret of the absolute unity of the Divine Being is closely connected with the principle that sinlessness is not the inde-

pendent possession of any mortal being but a thing flowing from a higher source, the gift of God to such of his servants as implore for it day and night.

We have not the least hesitation in admitting that *istighfar* comes to have a secondary meaning, but this sense of the word does not in any way impair its true and primary significance which remains unchanged. In its extended sense the word comes to mean "praying for the protection of God from the consequences of faults already committed." It must be noted that the idea of praying for the protection of God, the root idea, is still present in the new sense, though in this case the protection is sought from the punishment which must befall a person in consequence of a sin which he has committed. But in this sense the word has never been used of those whom God terms His chosen ones and His associates and whom He states as having near access to Him. For to them God has promised that no punishment shall touch them and that they shall be seated in the lap of God's mercy. How can their *istighfar* be construed to mean a prayer to be saved from hell-fire and everlasting damnation notwithstanding that it is said of them لا يسمعون حسيسها *i.e.*, "They shall not hear the slightest sound of hell-fire," unless it be supposed that they have no faith in the promises of God. He whom God described as His mercy for the whole world saying وما ارسلنك الا رحمة للعلمين can hardly be imagined to be still in doubt as to whether he shall be taken in the mercy of God or not.

Verses from which it appears that the prophets of God are simply as it were tools in the hands of God and that their ownself is annihilated and lost, abound in the Holy Quran. Thus the greatest of them is commanded by Almighty God: قل ان صلوتى ونسكى ومحياى ومماتى لله رب العلمين "Say verily my condition is such that my own personality has become quite extinct, and my devotion and my sacrifice and my life and my death are solely and exclusively for God, the Lord of the worlds." This verse proves conclusively that the prophets do not speak but when God makes them speak, and that they do not act but when God makes them act. Whatever they say or do, is said or done in obedience to the commandments of God and they

have not the power to act against His will. They are dead to all besides God and are so absorbed in Him that every trace of self is lost. Their words and deeds are all in resignation to, and in accordance with, the will of God. For instance, it is elsewhere said of the Holy Prophet in the Word of God وما رميت اذ رميت ولكن الله رمى "Whatever it appeared that thou didst cast, thou didst not cast it but it was God who did it," and again وما ينطق عن الهوى ان هو الا وحى يوحى "The prophet does not speak out of impulse or his own desire but every word that his lips utter is the Word of God that is revealed to him." Thus both the words and deeds of the Holy Prophet are spoken of in plain terms as the words and deeds of God. In short, the Word of God has clearly asserted that the prophets are manifestations of the Divine will, and that they have no desire of their own. Every breath of their life and even their death, as the verse quoted above asserts, is purely for the sake of God and quite free from every mixture of the glory of self. Their souls are bowed down before the Divine threshold so completely and with such sincere devotion, that not the slightest share of others than God can be traced in them.

The Holy Quran teems with similar verses but the limits of our subject do not allow us to quote them all here. We shall add to those given above one from the chapter headed "The Prophets." There it is said : وما ارسلنا من قبلك من رسول الا نوحى اليه انه لا اله الا انا فاعبدون وقالوا اتخذ الرحمن ولدا سبحنه بل عباد مكرمون لا يسبقونه بالقول وهم بامره يعملون ۰ يعلم ما بين ايديهم وما خلفهم ولا يشفعون الا لمن ارتضى وهم من خشيته مشفقون ۰ ومن يقل منهم انى اله من دونه فذالك نجزيه جهنم كذالك نجزى الظلمين (الانبياء) "And no apostle have we sent before thee, O Prophet! to whom we did not reveal that there is no God besides me, therefore worship me. Yet they (the Christians) say that the God of mercy has begotten a son (Jesus). Glory be to God; the apostles are but His honored servants (and Jesus was one of them); *they speak not till He has spoken, and at His bidding do they act.* He knoweth what is before them and what is behind them; and they shall not intercede but for him with whom He is pleased, and they fear God. But if an apostle were to say 'I am a god besides God' (as the Christians suppose Jesus to have said), such a one will we punish with hell: in this manner do we punish

the offenders." These verses which occur in the chapter entitled "The Prophets" we have quoted at some length in order to show that in the whole passage, before as well as after the italicised words, none but the prophets is spoken of. The words given in italics are those to which we wish to draw the reader's attention. Of the prophets of God it is here stated that they do not speak till God has spoken and that they do nothing till God has bidden them to do it. Here again Almighty God identifies the words and deeds of the prophets with His own words and deeds, and, therefore, the prophets can never be said to act against His will. And how can they, when they are sent to execute the will of God? How can the executor of the will of God oppose that will or act against it; and if he does, he cannot be the executor. As manifestations of the Divine Being, they are also manifestations of His words and deeds. It may not be out of place to remark here that although there is only a supposition in the words "If an apostle were to say I am a god," and that supposition is negatived by the next clause which says that he shall be punished with hell (because Almighty God has also said that no prophet of God shall go to hell), yet we cannot deny that there may be here an allusion to the Christian doctrine which first makes the prophet Jesus assert godhead and then sends him to hell.

The verses quoted above, and other similar verses in the Holy Quran, put the question beyond all doubt that Almighty God regards the words and deeds of the prophets as His own words and deeds, and that they turn only as He turns them. They are like dead men in the hands of God. They have not their own passions or desires, nor are their movements or their utterances or their resolutions their own. Movement or rest, pleasure or pain, happiness or grief, love or enmity, forgivenes or revenge, charity or parsimony, courage or timidness, mercy or wrath, cannot be ascribed to them, for they have no will or feelings of their own. They are under the full control of the Almighty and their faculties are all engaged in His service.

Thus, though *istighfar* primarily means only a prayer for the protection and support of God, and is in that sense used of the holy prophets of God, its meaning is extended in the case of the generality of mankind for whom both prayers are needed, *viz.*, a prayer for protection from the punishment of sins committed and a prayer for future protec-

tion from the commission of sins. This combination of both prayers in the same word reveals a deep knowledge of human nature. It shows that the Holy Quran does not regard a mere remorse for the past faults as true repentance unless it is accompanied with a true and ardent desire to be saved from sin and a resolution to avoid sinful conduct in the future. *Istighfar*, therefore, answers both yearnings of the human nature and responds to both the needs which a man can have for salvation. Thus *istighfar* is the highest form of prayer for all classes of persons.

Istighfar as here explained on the basis of the Holy Quran is the true and only means of drawing the strength and support of God, the only course for attaining the nearness of God and the only path by walking in which a man may attain to sinlessness and salvation, and no sensible person would, we think, have any hesitation in admitting it as such. But those who instead of trusting in God, trust in the blood of a man, can never realize the blessings of *istighfar*. Their strength and support is not in God but in a weak man who was crucified (as they say) some two thousand years ago. They reject *istighfar* as the true remedy for sin, abuse the prophets of God, insult God Himself, and hold that out of the hundreds of thousands of men that are crucified and hanged in every age as being pernicious to society, the crucifixion of one particular man whom they name, has taken away the sins of all the world or at least of that portion of it who think that this crucifixion had really such an effect. He was born like ordinary men, had all their weaknesses and failings, was subject to the same suffering and diseases as other mortals are, never showed that he possessed Divine power in the slightest degree, and at last died the death of a great culprit, yet we must take him for a god because the Christian Missionaries say so. If the understandings of these men cannot realize the sublime significance of *istighfar*, they must be excused, for a false doctrine has dulled their brains.

To make the matter more clear, we shall however produce further evidence from the Holy Quran that a resorting to *istighfar* is looked upon by the holy book as the highest accomplishment of *good* men. Thus in the chapter entitled the "Scattering" we read:

ان المتقين فی جنت و عیون اخذین ما آتهم ربهم انهم کانوا قبل

ذ لک محسنين • کا نو ا قليلا من ا لليل ما يهجعو ن • وبا لا سحا ر هم يستغفر و ن (ا لذ ريت) Verily the righteous shall dwell amid gardens and fountains with the blessings which their Lord hath given them; this is a reward to them, for before this they were the greatest doers of good, passed the greater part of night in devotion to God and when morning came they resorted to *istighfar*, *i.e.*, sought the Divine strength and support." It should be noted that in this verse *istighfar* is described as a deed of righteousness, the effect of which as here stated, is not that they were saved from the punishment of hell but that Divine blessings and favors were showered upon them in abundance, and rich rewards were given to them on account of their *istighfar*. The word *muhsin* used in this verse has been defined by the prophet himself as denoting a person who worships God with the sincere devotion of one who actually sees Him or at least of one who deems himself in the presence of God, and, therefore, cannot turn aside from His path. It should be further noted that when a person reaches the stage at which he sees God, he cannot sin; for then he is certain that the Almighty God in whose presence he stands shall consume him if he goes against His will; and at that stage he shuns sin and keeps away from it as a person keeps away from burning fire, being certain that the fire shall consume the part of his body which it touches. Now the verse says that the blessings of God shall be given to men as a reward for their goodness, and this goodness is described as consisting in their praying to God for the greater part of the night and their resorting to *istighfar* in the morning. If *istighfar* is to be limited to a prayer for protection from the punishment of evil, the verse would be quite meaningless. It would be strange that men who were in the presence of God all night, should ask pardon for their sins in the morning, as if they looked upon their devotion as a sin, and standing in the presence of God all night as a transgression, and, therefore, made up for these sins in the morning by asking pardon. The plain import of the words of this verse is that men who overcome the power of evil, and keep themselves in the presence of God during the night, pray for the Divine protection and support in the morning to keep them firm in His path and not to let them slip, for they feel that without the strength and support of God they would not be able to overcome the frailties of their nature, and, therefore, pray afresh for the Divine gift that the bliss which they enjoy in the presence of the

Lord might not be lost by the weakness of their flesh. This is the plain and natural interpretation that we can put upon the words. But if *istighfar* is simply construed as asking pardon for sins which a man has committed, the words "They resorted to *istighfar* in the morning" ought to have followed some such statement as "They kept sinning during the night," because the natural consequence in that case would be that having committed sins during the night, they asked pardon for them in the morning.

Another verse which shows that the Holy Quran considers *istighfar* as a highly commendable deed for the righteous is the following: الصبرين والصدقين والقنتين والمنفقين والمستغفرين بالاسحار "The patient, and the truthful, and the lowly and the charitable, and those who resort to *istighfar* at morning times." In the first place this verse renders *istighfar* a necessity for the good. To be righteous a man is not only commanded to practise virtues such as patience, truth, lowliness and charity, but is also commanded to constantly resort to *istighfar*. From this it is clear that *istighfar* not only saves one from punishment but also like other virtues draws the blessings and favors of God in abundance. Secondly, by closing the enumeration of the virtues with the word مستغفرين, it is plainly indicated that all these virtues are given to the person who resorts to *istighfar*. Both these points conclusively settle the meaning of *istighfar* and show that it is primarily a prayer to God to be able to act according to His will and to be protected and supported against the weaknesses of the flesh.

Not only is *istighfar* described as leading to virtuous deeds, but *maghfirat* is also promised as the gift of God to to those who lead a virtuous course of life. Thus we read الا الذين صبروا وعملوا الصلحت اولئك لهم مغفرة واجر كبير (هود) "But those who stick to virtue and shun vice and do the deeds that are righteous, to them shall be granted *maghfirat* and a great reward." The proper significance of the word صبر is الصبر على الطاعة والصبر عن المعصية and, therefore, we have so translated it. Here *maghfirat* is promised as a reward to those who do righteous deeds. In this case it is clear that *maghfirat* cannot mean pardon for sins because the persons to whom it is promised are plainly described as being those who have been doing righteous deeds. This *maghfirat* is clearly the

strength and support of God granted to the righteous by which they are enabled to make spiritual progress and advance higher and higher towards perfection. In fact, since *maghfirat* is the protection and support of God, a man always stands in need of *maghfirat* in the same manner as he stands in need of God. He cannot be independent of the one as he cannot be independent of the other. Nay, a man resorts to *istighfar* in proportion to his spiritual advancement, and hence the need for *istighfar* never ceases. The *maghfirat* of God shall, therefore, continue even in paradise.

To this need of *maghfirat* even in paradise, the Holy Quran has attested elsewhere in plain words. Thus in Sura Muhammad occur the words with respect to those living in paradise: ولهم فيها من كل الثمرات ومغفرة من ربهم "For them in paradise shall be fruits of all sorts and *maghfirat* from their Lord." Here *maghfirat* is plainly described as a reward which shall be granted to the good *in paradise*. And again (التحريم) يقولون ربنا اتمم لنا نورنا واغفر لنا "(Those who shall enter into paradise) shall say 'O Lord, perfect our Light and grant us *maghfirat*." This unceasing desire for perfection and *maghfirat* shows clearly that progress in paradise shall be endless. From these two verses it is plain that even after an entry into paradise which shall only be possible after obtaining God's pardon to those who have committed sins, the faithful shall still have a continual desire for *maghfirat* or in other words they shall still resort to *istighfar*, though they shall have been saved from punishment. According to the secondary meaning of *istighfar* which the opponents of Islam will fain have as the only interpretation, the object of *istighfar* is nothing but to be saved from punishment, *i. e.*, the punishment which awaits a man for the sins he has committed. *Maghfirat* in this sense can only be desired by a person before he is rewarded or punished for his deeds. But the person who has entered into paradise after the pardon of his sins if he had committed any, cannot think of any punishment falling upon him, for he is in the abode of bliss where there shall be no pain or punishment of any sort and from which he is never to be expelled as God has promised, وما هم بمخرجين منها "And they shall not be expelled from paradise." Why shall then those who have entered into paradise say ربنا اغفرلنا "O Lord, grant us *maghfirat*" and why does God mention *maghfirat* as one of the blessings in paradise, saying

لهم فيها مغفرة "For them in paradise shall be *maghfirat*"? Evidently enough, *istighfar* in this case is not a prayer to be saved from the punishment of sins.

What does *maghfirat* in paradise mean then? In this world and with this body there is the possibility to sin against which the Divine protection and support is sought for. Shall there be the same possibility in paradise? The Devil cannot tempt there. But it must be clearly understood that there are even in this world men whom the devil cannot tempt and over whom the evil one has no power. The Holy Quran says: ان عبادی لیس لک علیهم سلطان "O Satan, thou hast no control over my chosen servants." But notwithstanding this they are still commanded to pray and to resort to *istighfar*. In answering this we again draw the reader's attention to the necessity for *istighfar*. *Istighfar*, as we have already shown, is a requirement of the nature of man and of the attributes of God. There is the Creator who is perfect and who has the attribute of support which must remain constantly at work so long as there are creatures. On the other hand, there are the creatures of God, *i. e.*, men, who are dependent upon the Creator for their perfection and for their support so long as they are creatures. Hence the necessity of *istighfar*. But we know it for certain that notwithstanding continual progress men shall still be creatures and still dependent upon God. Any degree of perfection to which they may attain in this world or the next, cannot be equivalent to the perfection of the Creator. They are still creatures and must still depend upon the Creator however high they may rise. Hence the continual necessity of *istighfar*. In paradise the righteous shall be ever ascending upwards and shall regard every state as defective in comparison with a higher one to which they shall aspire and shall, therefore, pray to God to suppress the defective state that they may get to the higher. Hence, since progress is endless, the desire for *maghfirat* shall never cease.

There are many other verses showing clearly that the Christians have not made any approach to a right understanding of the sublime and exalting signification of *istighfar*, but as the subject has already grown more lengthy than we intended to make it at the outset, we refrain for the present from making any more quotations from the Holy Quran. To one more fact in this connection we would draw the

reader's attention. The Christian Missionaries insist that the verse ليغفر لک ا لله ما تقد م من ذ نبک occurring in the chapter entitled the "Victory" refers to the pardon of sins granted to our Holy Prophet which he had actually committed. Leaving the true interpretation of this verse for some other occasion, we wish here to point out the absurdity of the interpretation which the opponents of Islam insist upon as the true interpretation. According to all authorities the chapter entitled the "Help" was revealed after the "Victory," for the "Victory" was revealed before the conquest of Mecca while the "Help" was revealed after Mecca was taken. Now in the "Help" Almighty God says to the Holy Prophet و ا ستغفر ه "and resort to *istighfar* or seek the *maghfirat* of God," which our adversaries would construe into "ask pardon for thy sins," whereas they also hold that all his sins, past and future, had been pardoned at the time that the "Victory" was revealed. All these inconsistencies are the result of misinterpretation, and if they had the slightest sense of justice they would have admitted their error.

In conclusion we may make a passing reference to another absurdity of the Christian Missionaries who hold and publish that all the prophets are spoken of as having resorted to *istighfar* and that Jesus alone has not been so spoken of and then boast of it as a ground of Jesus' superiority over other prophets and of his exclusive sinlessness. From what has been said above, it is clear that if the Christian assertion is true, and if Jesus really did not resort to *istighfar*, it would be a ground of his inferiority and sinfulness, inasmuch as he did not seek the support of God. But the assertion is not true. Jesus has been mentioned as one of the righteous men, and, therefore, whatever is said of them is also said of Jesus. On one occasion we have ا لذ ين صبرو ا و عملو ا ا لصحت لهم مغفرة If Jesus was one of those who stuck to virtue and shunned vice and did righteous deeds, he was certainly granted *maghfirat*. Many other verses quoted above apply to him in the same way. On one occasion the Word of God says of angels و يستغفرو ن لمن فى الا رض "And they always pray for the *maghfirat* of God for all those who are upon earth." If Jesus ever lived upon earth, the angels must have prayed for his *maghfirat*. We hope such absurdities would not be given place again in Christian writings. They had better let us know how Jesus is sinless according to the Gospels.

Notes and Comments.

THE PUNJAB CENSUS REPORT.—In noting the progress of the Ahmadiyya sect in the last issue we quoted the figures for the Bombay Presidency. Since then we have received the Punjab Census Report, which shows 1,113 males over the age of 15 belonging to the sect (Census of 1901). This can by no means be taken as the precise number or even as approximating to reasonable precision. With 11,087 in the Bombay Presidency and 931 in the N.-W. P., we can hardly believe Punjab, the centre of the efforts of the propaganda, as containing a little over a thousand men. There are several reasons on the surface why there should be such an incomplete return. Firstly, the name Ahmadiyya itself was not given out as the distinctive title of the sect until after the Census operations had commenced. In a country like India where the majority of the people is uneducated, the fact could not have been made known to all the members of the sect within a short time. In villages and in distant and out of the way places, it was almost impossible to go and inform every individual member that the sect to which he belonged had been given such and such a name. Letters were received from many members of the sect after the Census was over that they were not informed of the name in time. Secondly, as a general rule, very little attention is paid by the census-takers to ascertain the sect or to make a correct entry of it. The enumerators are themselves mostly very poorly educated persons, and they regard the entry of the sect as the most unimportant thing while the people themselves are not fully awake to the necessity of returning their sect. The Census Report has itself admitted the wide discrepancy of its returns from the exact members in some cases. The third and the most important factor is the strong religious prejudice that prevails against the new sect among all classes, and in enlisting such a large enumerating force as was required for the vast population of India, every available person had to be taken, as the large majority of the population is uneducated.

It is unnecessary to state that the progress which the sect is making in the Punjab is unparalleled. In a single day at Jhelum where the Promised Messiah had to go on the 17th January, about six hundred per-

sons entered into his *baiat*. In fact, the peaceful doctrines of the sect as to the relation with man and its sublime teachings as to the relation with God are a powerful attraction to all intelligent men.

The Punjab Census Report, however, contains a very serious error with regard to the antecedents of the leader and guide of the Ahmadiyya sect, for the removal of which the Promised Messiah has called the attention of the Government in a petition, dated the 27th January, which runs as follows :—

"1. That in the Punjab Census Report, Part I (Census of India 1901, Volume XVII), Chapter III, paragraph 39, page 143. it is said of me that I began my work "as a *Maulvi* with a special mission to the sweepers."

"2. That this statement is altogether false and groundless, and most injurious and harmful to my honor and reputation.

"3. That the man who claimed a special mission to the sweepers is quite a different man, Imam-ud-Din by name, whose principles are altogether opposed to Islam and hated by me as well as all true Muhammadans as detestable doctrines, and that he has been my bitterest opponent for over thirty years, and that it is most unjust and unfair to attribute his principles to me notwithstanding that I hate them.

"4. That the sweeper class is specially associated with crimes and to represent me as connected with that class when there is not the slightest foundation for such a charge is to represent me as being in a state generally considered disgraceful. The sweepers in this country are looked upon as the most degenerate class of people, and the statement made in the Census Report is calculated to do the greatest harm to my reputation and to hurt the feelings not only of myself but also of thousands of the most loyal and respectable subjects of the Government who follow me as their guide and leader in all religious and spiritual matters.

"5. That my principles and doctrines which I have been preaching since the very beginning are morally so sublime and spiritually so exalted that they are not suited to, and accepted by, even Muhammadans of a low type and bad morals, to say nothing of the sweepers, and that they are accepted only by intelligent and noble-minded men who lead pure and angelic lives, and that my followers actually include in their number Raises, Jagirdars, respectable Government Officials, Merchants, Pleaders, learned *Maulvis* and highly educated young men.

"6. That a similar statement regarding me had been made in the *Gurdaspur Gazetteer* and that attention of the Government being called to it, the Government was kind enough to reply in its letter No. 93, dated 16th March 1901 (just at the time when the Census Operation

were over) Home Dept., Sub-Head petition, File No. *nil*, that the passage shall be excised from the Gazetteer at the time of revision and that the Deputy Commissioner of Gurdaspur had been instructed accordingly.

"7. That the statement has now been inserted in a volume where it will do the greatest harm to my reputation and honor if allowed to remain uncontradicted, as the Census Report shall be taken as a reliable authority throughout the world.

"8. That the statement has even now been published in the *Civil & Military Gazette* upon the authority of the Census Report, in the issue of 23rd January 1903, under the heading of the Punjab Census Report —II, and that similar statements will no doubt appear in all the papers if the statement is not contradicted immediately, and thus I shall be misrepresented and associated with a very low class of society with which I have not, nor ever had, the least connection.

"9. That I belong to a family of Cheifs which the Government has always honored on account of the valuable service which it has been doing to the cause of Government and that such a misrepresentation regarding me is calculated to cast a slur and a discredit on the honor and reputation of this noble family.

"10. That the Government can ascertion the absolute falsity and groundlessness of this statement so far as I am concerned through District Officers."

The closing words of the report with regard to the Ahmadiyya sect are:

"The sect however emphatically repudiates the doctrine that the Mahdi of Islam will be a warrior and relies on the Sahih Bokhári, the most authentic of the traditions, which says "he shall wage no wars but discontinue war for the sake of religion.' In his voluminous writings the Mirza has combated the doctrine of *Jehad*, and the sect is thus opposed to the extreme section of the Ahl-i-Hadis."

REVELATIONS OF THE PROMISED MESSIAH.—*9th January.*—ان وعد الله اتى وركل وركا فطوبى لمن وجد ورای قتل خيبة وزيد هيبة*

11th January—I was shown a paper in a vision and when I looked at it, I saw that its heading was بقية الطاعون † Its back appeared to contain an announcement written by myself.

17th February—يوم الاثنين وفتح الحنين‡

*Verily the promise of God has come, and it pawed and mended the affair; blessed is he who found this promise and saw it. One is brought to destruction in failure and his destruction is awful.

†The remainder of plague.

‡ Monday and the victory of Honein.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] MARCH, 1903. [No. 3.

بسم ا لله ا لرحمن ا لرحيم
نحمد ه و نصلى على ر سوله ا لكريم

Religious Conversion

AND

The Respective Merits of Islam, Christianity and Arya Samaj.

(By Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Promised Messiah.)

In the Name of God, the Merciful and the Compassionate.

Our souls and bodies bow down in submission before the Almighty, true and perfect God whose hand has made every atom of matter and every soul with all their properties. Our trust is in Him to whom every being owes its existence and who alone preserves and upholds it. He knows the inmost secrets of the heart and His knowledge comprehends all; He rules over all and His power is all—encompassing; and whatever is, has been brought into existence by His creating hand. May the mercy, peace and blessings of God be showered in full abundance upon the Holy Prophet Muhammad, through whom we found the Living God who reveals the secret of His existence by His word spoken to us, and unveils the shining face of His eternal power, perfect glory and wondrous might by showing us His supernatural signs. Blessed be the name of the noble Prophet who has showed us God, and praised be the name of the wise and mighty God who has with His unbounded power made everything. How great and mighty is His power which brings everything into existence and upholds it! Such is our God whose blessings, power, beauty and goodness know no bounds. He is the only God in heaven and earth; besides Him there is no other God.

A notice from the Arya Samaj of Qadian has been handed to me. It is dated the 7th February 1903, and bears the coarse heading: "A reply to a boast of the disciples of the Qadiani Pope." The notice is full of harsh and abusive language used of our Lord and Master the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, of myself and of my respectable followers. Other announcements of a similar nature from the Samaj leaders have also reached us, while the leading Aryan papers have also given vent to their feeling of animosity towards Islam in long articles couched in no better language. On account of the vulgarity of the tone of these notices, I had no mind to answer them, but the Word of God came upon me, commanding me to write a reply and saying "I shall be with thee" in the writing of it. The glad tidings contained in this revelation that I was not to be alone in writing this reply gave me much pleasure. Thus inspired and strengthened by God I rose and wrote the following reply with the assistance of His spirit. In obedience to the Divine instruction I shall answer these notices in mild language, dealing only with the portion which requires refutation and omitting the portion which contains nothing but abusive language used of me and my Master the Holy Prophet, and leave the rest to God in whom is my trust.

Before beginning to answer the Arya Samajists, I enjoin my followers to bear patiently all the abusive language which the Arya Samajic writers of the announcements and the articles have, with no other intention than to hurt our feelings, used either of the Holy Prophet wording in coarse and abusive language their alleged objections against him, or of myself calling me a deceiver, a liar, a defrauder, a traitor, a swindler, and using other scandalous appellations of this sort, or of my followers using of them such base and contemptuous epithets as dogs, swine, asses and monkeys, and calling them *malechh* and carrion-eaters. Let them not give way to any excitement at these offensive and scurrilous words but endure them with manly forbearance. I am not unaware of the excitement to which human nature is liable on provocation, especially when a man is not only himself abused but also the person whom he considers his prophet and spiritual guide and the leader of his faith, is abused and held up to scorn, and hateful and contemptuous words are spoken of him. Such abuse is, no doubt, enough

to provoke a saint, but I say to you that if you do not bear these contumelies patiently, in what will lie your superiority over other people? Think not that you alone are thus abused and that the righteous before you were not received in this manner. The world has always borne enmity to and hated every true dispensation which heaven has established upon earth. Since you are the heirs to truth, it is necessary that the world should be at enmity with you. Beware lest you should be carried away by passion. Bear every harshness, and answer every abuse in mild language and your reward shall be on heaven. You should not abuse the Rishis and the sacred leaders of the Hindus that they may not abuse the Holy God and His Holy Prophet, for they do not know whom they abuse. Bear in mind that every one who gets excited cannot utter words of true wisdom and knowledge. Nay, every word that drops from the lips of a man who is foaming with rage sows the seed of dissension without effecting any good object. If you desire to speak under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, let your hearts be free from passion and excitement. Then will the Holy Spirit make your hearts its habitation and then will your lips give utterance to secrets of pure knowledge. Then will you be regarded upon heaven as useful for the world and your ages shall be blessed and lengthened. When you talk, there should be no vanity or derision in your talk, nor should your words be tinged with lightness. Be earnest in your conversation and you will utter the word of true wisdom. Derisive and contemptuous words lead to dissension but the words of wisdom conquer the hearts. Convey the truth to other people in polite words so far as you can, lest your hearers should be disgusted. Impure is the man who does not grasp the reality but led by his unbridled passions speaks irreverently and abusively and lays the snares of plots. Such a one cannot find his way to God nor are his lips ever moved to give utterance to words of truth and wisdom. If you wish that the ways of God should be opened to you, yield not to your passions and do not enter into religious controversies lightly, for this is nothing but waste of time. Return not evil for evil neither in your words nor in your deeds, and your God shall stand up for you. Invite men to the truth with a compassionate and sympathetic heart and not in a frivolous manner. Dead is the heart which treats religious truths frivolously and lightly, and impure the soul which neither walks itself in the path

of truth and wisdom nor likes that another should walk in it. If you wish to be heirs to sacred knowledge, speak not a word under excitement, for such a word shall be devoid of wisdom and knowledge. Do not think of silencing your antagonist with insulting and derisive words, but reply to him with an upright heart in true and wise words that you may be made heirs to the secrets of heaven.

It is necessary to state here that the Arya Samaj has taken the initiative in attacking me. I did not address the Samaj in any recent writing of mine, nor was any handbill issued by me or under my direction or at my instance. They have levelled their attacks and hurled abuses and anathemas at me and my master the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and thus doubly injured me, without any provocation on my part, and I cannot understand the reason of this excitement. I have often told some members of the Arya Samaj of Qadian who came to me that true religion does not consist in clever talk. Religion is a holy feeling of true devotion arising in the mind of a person who knows and recognises the true and living God. I have often warned them of the awful signs of the times and drawn their attention to the havoc that the plague is working. I have told them that whenever it has raged in a country, it has been because of the daring iniquities and transgressions of the people and their rejection of him whom God has sent for the reformation of the world. It is when some such grave sin has been committed and people have become too bold in vice that Almighty God sends this visitation. In this age too, this sin has reached its culminating point. A glorious Prophet came into the world for the regeneration of mankind, *i. e.*, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may God pour His choicest blessings upon him, and he called people to the path of the true and living God whom the world had quite forgotten and forsaken, but in the present age he has been held in such contempt and disdain and abused to such an extent that there is no parallel to it in any other period of history. Almighty God has moreover sent in the commencement of the 14th century of Hegira, a servant of His, *i. e.*, the writer, that he may bear witness to the truth, glory and grandeur of that great Prophet, and preach the unity of God and glorify Him, but he also has been

abused and anathematized. This is the reason of the calamities that have befallen the world in this age. There is no fear of God in the hearts of men, there is much of vain talking and babbling but as to real worth, the purity of heart, there is none. There is a great ado about society, and national considerations solely occupy the hearts which are totally devoid of every impression of the glory and majesty of God. In short, I have often exhorted the Aryas of Qadian in this manner but they have not benefitted themselves by such exhortations. They do not fear the majesty of God and do not tremble in His mighty presence. Perhaps they think that the plague will only bring about destruction in other villages, and that as to themselves inoculation has placed them beyond the reach of its devastating hand. Even in these dangerous days there are fearless men who abuse others unscrupulously. They never pause and consider for a moment that if the Holy Prophet whom they abuse and speak contemptuously of, was from God, as he certainly was, their insolence shall not go unpunished. Listen all ye who are unmindful of God, my experience and the experience of the righteous before me, speak in unfaltering tones that insolence towards the chosen prophets of God does not bear good fruit. Every one who thinks honestly knows that Almighty God has the power to punish men for every iniquity and every insolence and to requite them for every evil.

ANSWER TO AN OBJECTION.

We shall now consider the first objection of the Arya Samaj against the Hindu converts to Islam who have joined the Ahmadiyya movement. It is asserted that their change of religion is not sincere or based upon solid grounds. Before their conversion to Islam, they ought to have studied the four Vedas in Sanskrit, and then studied the sacred literature of Islam. After having studied all the phases of the two religions, they ought to have compared them and adopted the one which they might have considered as the true religion after this thorough research. Now as a matter of fact the Hindu converts to Islam, to whom the Arya Samaj alludes, have adopted Islam after making the necessary investigation. But as to the study of the four Vedas in the original language, the objection could be said to have at least been honestly raised if the objectors themselves had first given some

proof of their own erudition in the four Vedas. It is a pity that they have overlooked the principles of justice, and shown not the least fear of God in raising this objection. If their objection is based upon honest grounds, they should first show that all those Hindus who, a few years ago, knew nothing of the Hindu religion except the name of Rama and belonged to the orthodox sect of Sanatan Dharma, actually studied the four Vedas in Sanskrit before coming over to the sect of Daya Nand. If the Arya Samajists consider the study of the Vedas as a primary and indispensable condition for the change of religion, they cannot exempt themselves from this condition. They cannot deny that before Pundit Daya Nand began to preach the principles of the new sect, all the Hindoos belonged to the established faith of Sanatan Dharma which is even now the predominant sect of Hinduism, and has its temples and its Pundits learned in the Vedas. And we are bound to confess in justice to the two contending sections that so far as we can get any idea of the Vedic teaching from the Urdu and English translations of the four Vedas, the interpretation put upon the Vedas by the Sanatan Dharmists is the right interpretation. We do not however wish to enter into this discussion at present. Our object in referring to it is that the Arya Samajists themselves are answerable for the same objection which they urge against the Hindu converts to Islam. Not long ago all those who now fill the ranks of the Arya Samaj adhered to the old form of Hindu belief, in which they looked upon Rama and Krishna and other sages as deities and stuck to idol-worship as the true teaching of the Vedas, and above all according to the principles of the Vedanta, they considered themselves as having been brought into existence by God. But with their conversion to Arya Samaj all these ideas underwent a complete revolution. Instead of regarding themselves any more as creatures of God, they looked upon themselves as co-eternal with God and uncreated by His hands and thus arrogantly assumed the position of co-equality with the Lord of the universe. Was it not necessary for them before thus revolutionizing their faith to study the four Vedas and satisfy each one for himself that the old faith was not based upon the Vedas and that the new one was exactly what they taught? If the Qadian Arya Samajists and their brethren of other places regard their objection against the converts to Islam as an honest and fair one, they ought to prove to the satisfaction of all reasonable

persons that their numbers do not include a single person who is not a man "of erudition and learning," and who has not studied the four Vedas and "the Vedic religion in all its phases." If they can prove it we shall admit that their objection was really the outcome of honesty and fair—mindedness and did not proceed from a desire to conceal the truth and confound it with falsehood. We may however state it for the information of the public that the Qadian Arya Samaj shall be the last body in the world to prove its Vedic learning and erudition. So far as we know, the body is constituted of village-shopkeepers, money-lenders, retail grocers and small hucksters who are all ignorant of the Vedas. In contrast with this class of shop-keepers who have deserted their old Hindu faith for that of Pundit Daya Nand, the Hindus who accepted Islam are mostly young educated men of whom some have studied up to the B. A. standard, and who read the Vedas in Urdu and English and spend day and night in the study of religious lore. This absolute ignorance of the Vedas is not however limited to the Arya Samaj of Qadian, but the Samaj in every town and village can ordinarily claim no better men. There is not a grain of truth in the assertion that the Hindus who have deserted the Sanatan Dharma for the Arya Samajic offshoot did not change their religion until they had studied the Vedas. The majority of those who adhere to the Samajic doctrines are men who are engaged from morning till evening in their mercantile transactions and are as ignorant of the Vedas as they were before their conversion.

These are not mere assertions. I am willing to pay a thousand Rupees to the Arya Samajists if they can prove that even five per cent. of their total number are well-versed in the four Vedas in Sanskirit. And if they cannot, they must confess the absurdity of their objection against the converts to Islam. Now when thousands of Aryas are absolutely ignorant of the Vedas, and in their houses gods and goddesses and idols are worshipped, the objection of the ignorance of the Vedas in Sanskrit is not a valid, not even an honest, objection against the Hindus who upon comparing the principles of Islam, Sanatan Dharm and Arya Samaj, and finding truth and the majesty and glory of God in Islam only, accepted the true religion. When convinced of the truth of Islam, they accepted it notwithstanding, the numerous difficul-

ties and obstacles in their way with which a Hindu has never to cope when he comes over to the Arya Samaj. They suffered all for the sake of God, willingly parted with the Hindu society, were cut off from their parents, wives, brothers and friends, and heard every abuse with patience. To attribute their conversion to low motives is the last resort of the Arya Samaj. It is easy to make this allegation when every other argument fails. The large flow of Hinduism into Islam has often been ascribed to the compulsion of Muhammadan monarchs, to the attainment of worldly gains or to some other low motive. As to the groundlessness of the first charge, it is hardly necessary to state that with the passing away of power and government from the hands of Muhammadans, the large ingress of Hinduism into Islam has not ceased. Nay it has even been found on a comparison that the average rate of conversion during the seven centuries of Muslim supremacy in India is less than the rate of conversion during the last few decades of the British rule. The charge of the converts having any selfish end in view, is still more absurd, for many wealthy Hindu gentlemen and Hindu Raises and Rajas have spent large sums of money in the cause of Islam after their conversion to it. And I see that those of my followers who have come over to me from Hinduism are so zealous in the spreading of truth that out of their moderate earnings they willingly set apart a portion for the propagation of truth. These objections of the Arya Samaj are only daring falsehoods in the face of facts.

TO WHAT EXTENT IS RESEARCH NECESSARY FOR A CHANGE OF RELIGION.

From the above it would appear that the Arya Samaj does not consider the knowledge of the four Vedas as an essential requisite for those who desert the Sanatan Dharm in its favor. Why is then such knowledge, we may ask, necessary for one who leaves the Hindu religion for some other faith? Reason and justice both condemn the objection raised by the Arya Samaj. The fact is, as we have already stated, that for a Hindu who is not satisfied with his own religion and is convinced of the truth of another, it is not at all necessary that he should study the four Vedas in Sanskrit to declare for the one or against the other. For if this principle were held to be

true for a change of religious views, none but Pundits who are well-versed in the four Vedas and in all their religious lore would be entitled to change their religion. But the fact is that within the pale of Hinduism, thousands of Hindus who are absolutely ignorant of the Sanskrit language and the Vedas change their old religion for the Arya Samaj. In the Punjab alone where the last Census Report returns the Arya Samaj as counting a little over nine thousand males over the age of fifteen, it would be difficult to find many Pundits who may be said to be fully acquainted with the four Vedas and to be masters of the Vedic language and Vedic lore. The Arya Samaj moreover does not represent a departure from the orthodox faith in minor and secondary doctrinal points, but it differs in essential principles from the established Hindu faith. Just as the Arya Samaj makes use of the contemptuous appellation of *malechh* for those who are converted to Islam, the Sanatan Dharm applies the same epithet to those who desert their old faith for the Arya Samaj, which it looks upon as an heretical sect denying the authority of the Vedas. Notwithstanding this antagonism between the Sanatan Dharm and the Arya Samaj, conversion from the former to the latter being looked upon as a desertion of the Hindu religion, it never occurs that the Arya Samaj should earnestly and honestly advise the ignorant Hindus that are daily adding to its numbers, to study the four Vedas before their desertion of the old and the adoption of the new doctrines. The Arya Samaj has practically never acted upon the principle of barring admission to those who are not learned in the Vedas. We are, therefore, quite at a loss to understand the reason of the objection which the Arya Samajists have preferred against such of their co-religionists as have confessed Islam. The fact is that on account of the strong opposition which they must meet upon their conversion to Islam, they take special care in changing their religion and do not take a step until they are fully convinced of its truth and have actually seen the distinction between right and wrong. But to come to this conclusion, a man does not stand in need of the study of the Vedas in Sanskrit, for if it were so, the door of a change of religious views, would be at once closed, and the Arya Sámaj also shall have to send back the thousands of Hindus who have accepted its doctrines without going

through the Vedas to the Sanatan Dharm faith, and shall have to be content with one individual or two, excluding all the rest until they are fully instructed in the four Vedas.

THE THREE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS CONVERSION.

Having seen that it is neither necessary nor desirable for a seeker after truth to study the gigantic mass of the sacred literature of every religion, the question would naturally arise as to the principles upon which a religion may be renounced or accepted and as to the criteria which distinguish a true religion from a false one. These principles are three in number. Firstly, it is necessary to consider its teaching as to the Divine Being. What does a religion, for instance, teach us as to the unity of God, His power, His knowledge, His perfection, His glory, His mercy, His reward and punishment and the other attributes of His Divinity? For, it is clear that a religion cannot be from God which does not consider God as one, but looks upon a heavenly body or an element of earth, or a man or any other thing as God or as the equal of God, and contains no injunctions against the worship of anything besides God, or does not consider God as Omnipotent but looks upon His power as imperfect, or does not teach the omniscience of God, or gives any teaching which is not consistent with His eternal glory, or inclines to an extreme view of His laws of punishment and mercy, or limits the means of His spiritual blessings or of seeking His connection to a particular nation or a particular country, and does not like His physical blessings extend them to the whole human race, or gives any teaching against His attributes.

Secondly, a seeker after truth must see the moral teachings of a religion. What does it teach as to his own conduct and as to his relation with mankind in general? He must satisfy himself that its teachings do not in any way interfere with the social relations of man, or that they do not violate the principles of chastity and modesty and preserve the integrity of the family, or that they are not opposed to the Divine laws as revealed in nature, or that they do not enjoin aught which is impossible to observe or likely to lead to dangerous consequences or leave aught that is necessary for the prevention of evil. It must also be seen that the teaching inculcates doctrines which strengthen the

tie of human love for God by impressing the Divine goodness and beneficience upon the heart, and draw a man from darkness to light and from remissness and lethargy to vivacity and life.

Thirdly, the seeker after truth should choose the religion which presents a living God and not a God whose existence is simply to be supposed, and who is to be believed in only upon the meagre authority of idle tales and stories of the past. The religion which presents a God who has no signs of life, does not deserve to be so called. Any one who recognises such a God believes in him out of his credulity and not because the true and living God has revealed Himself to him, and he lays his supposed Deity under an obligation. It is foolish to bow submission to a God whose power is not felt and who is not able to manifest the signs of his life and power. Such a Deity cannot grant a pure life to a man, nor can he draw him out of the darkness of doubt. A living ox is better than a dead deity, for the ox is after all useful to men. The person who is not bent upon worldliness and evil, shall certainly seek the living God that He may purify and enlighten his soul, and shall not be content with a religion in which the living God does not manifest the signs of His power and comfort the spiritual wayfarers with His sweet and glorious voice.

These are the three criteria by which the truth of a religion may be judged and it is in these three matters that the superiority of one religion over another may be easily discovered. It is, therefore, necessary for a seeker after truth to judge a religion in these three respects, and if he finds that one religion has a manifest superiority over another when judged by these three criteria, he is bound to accept it. For this research, however, a man need not be a great Pundit or a Clergyman. Any one who has an ordinary share of common sense and intelligence can easily judge the merits of a religion for himself in these respects. As Almighty God has out of His mercy supplied every necessity of life and placed it within the reach of all those who wish to avail themselves of it, and do not deliberately and intentionally wish to destroy their own lives, in the same manner He has facilitated the ways of guidance and means of salvation for the spiritual life of mankind, so that in this short life they may not have to cope with insurmountable

difficulties in discovering the truth. Upon the three principles above stated, the merits of every religion can be easily tested by every person who has an ordinary share of common sense without spending years of his life in the study of the gigantic masses of different religious literatures. The principles of every religion are published by its supporters and any one who takes the trouble may test them by the above mentioned criteria. Any concealment or misstatement is not likely to remain unexposed because access to the hidden treasures of knowledge has been rendered easy in this age, and the truth comes to light in a hundred different ways.

From this it is clear that to change one's religion it is not at all necessary to study the whole mass of religious literature, but that the truth or falsehood of a religion may be easily discovered by the application of three tests to its principles as stated by its advocates. Now the Hindu converts to Islam did not accept Islam until they had satisfied themselves as to its truth by these three tests. Their coming over to the side of Islam after this necessary research, cannot give rise to any objection in relation to the sincerity of their conversion, though one of them, as we are told by the Arya papers, may be a "goldsmith." But the wonder is that the Arya Samaj has never thought of the numerous goldsmiths, money-lenders and petty Bunya shop-keepers who swell the numbers of the Arya Samaj, and who have deserted their ancient faiths of Sanatan Dharm and Sikhism without ever having learnt the Vedas or the Granth and without having ever tested the truth or the falsehood of any religion upon the three sound principles stated above. People who have never made the necessary research in religious principles in changing their own religion come forward to impose a condition upon conversion to Islam which it is impossible for any seeker after truth to observe. Instead of making bold to deceive the public by a false objection they ought to have blushed at their own ignorance. For a seeker after truth it is sufficient to ascertain three things with respect to any religion, *viz.*, its teachings in relation to God, its teachings in relation to his fellow-beings, and last, though not least, the fruit of these teachings, *i. e.*, whether they actually take him to the living God and reveal to him the face of the hidden Being. If he finds that a religion answers these three requisites as explained above, and has no defect when tested by these three criteria, he should be certain that he

has found the true religion, for a false religion does not bring this comfort with it.

We shall now show that these three excellences are found exclusively in Islam and that all other religions are totally devoid of them. We shall take for this purpose three religions, *viz.*, Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism as represented by the Arya Samaj. We are sorry that we cannot give this subject a comprehensive treatment for the short space at our disposal and, therefore, we shall be as brief as possible.

The Teachings of Christianity, Arya Samaj and Islam in relation to God.

CHRISTIAN TEACHINGS IN RELATION TO GOD.

We take Christianity first of all. The Christians look upon Jesus Christ as a perfect God. According to their belief he has four souls, *viz.*, he is God the Son, God the Father, God the Holy Ghost and man. And this square God shall, it is asserted, remain for ever the possessor of these four souls. It is rather nearer the truth to call him a five-sided God for he has also a body which shall exist with him for ever. But we are not told whether the part of his body that was cut off at his circumcision or the part that suffered from natural decay shall be ever re-united with his everlasting body, or whether it shall remain eternally separated from it. It is a recognised law that particles of the human body are constantly disappearing from it while new particles take their stead and that the whole body is completely changed within three years. Since Jesus was subject to this physical law, it is clear that his body also must have undergone complete transformation eleven times during the thirty-three years that he lived upon earth. The question, therefore, awaits solution whether all the particles of his body which continued disappearing under this physical law shall ever be re-united with the body with which he rose to hea-

ven. If not, there must be some reason for the glorification of the particles constituting the body of Jesus at the time of his crucifixion and the eternal separation of all previous particles that once constituted his body. Are we to think that it was because of any sins or must we attribute it to some other cause? And there is the further difficulty that if Jesus rose with his body, the body must still be subject to the decay of old particles and the growth of new ones, because the body not having changed must be still subject to the same law, and during the two thousand years that Jesus has been upon heaven, it must have changed hundreds of times. His alleged godhead cannot be proof against the decay of the particles of his body because his godhead was not able to interrupt the course of the physical laws of nature when he was upon earth. If the particles of his body which was the dwelling-place of Divinity, constantly disappeared and mingled in dust when he was upon earth, why is not the body with which he now sits on heaven subject to a change? In the human body we witness these changes daily. As soon as man is born, the process of decay and growth commences. Even a superficial eye can see that we always stand in need of having superfluous hair and nails cut off. But to attribute decay to God is an insult to Him. The Christian perhaps will say that this is a mystery, just as the union of the four souls in one body is a mystery. But this answer betrays only weakness, and it is nothing but a tactic to get rid of the difficulty.

This five-sidedness of the Christian Deity is further open to the objection that it usually passes under the name of Trinity. As a matter of fact the Christian belief makes the body of Jesus the habitation of the three souls of the Trinity and considers the fourth, *i. e.*, the human soul, as also united with them eternally and inseparably, and to these four adds an unchangeable body. This would make Jesus a five-fold complex, and it is strongly objectionable to call it a Trinity. The inventors of this doctrine made an error in calling it a Trinity but it is never too late to mend. Errors of this sort must be corrected as they are discovered. Some time ago, it was proposed to change the word تثليث (*taslis*) which means to divide by three into لوث (*salus*) which is the exact equivalent of Trinity. The very nature of the Christian Deity renders it necessary to make such amendments from time to time.

In short, the Christian religion does not profess the doctrine of the unity of God. It has turned away from the true and living God and made for itself a new God, the son of a Jewess. But is their god omnipotent like the true God? His own narrative is sufficient to throw light upon this point. Had he the Divine power in him, he would not have been disgraced and beaten by the Jews, dragged into courts of justice, put under arrest and nailed to the cross. And when the Jews had asked him to come down from the cross if he had any power, he ought to have come down and given them proof of his Divinity. But he did not show his Divine powers on a single occasion. His miracles are cited as proof of his almightiness, but in point of miracles he is inferior to many of the Israelite prophets. If a Christian were to compare the miracles of Jesus with those of Elijah, he shall have to admit that the miracles of Elijah have an undoubted superiority over those of Jesus in the power and glory which they manifest. The miracle of casting out devils, no doubt, frequently occurs in the Gospels, and has been considered as one of his greatest miracles. But modern science looks upon demoniacal possession as a superstition and a mockery. It was healing men of apoplexy which is described in the Gospels as the casting out of devils. Medical science has placed it beyond all doubt that apoplexy is a disease like other diseases and does not afford any room for the devils to come in. The Holy Quran has cleared Jesus of this charge of superstition by omitting the casting out of devils while mentioning his other miracles. It is important to note that the Quran does not relate the miracles of Jesus because of any superiority in them. The object of the Quran was to refute the allegations of the Jews who not only denied his miracles but also called him a deceiver and a false prophet. For a similar reason the Holy Quran refers to the mother of Jesus as a *Siddiqa, i.e.*, a chaste and righteous woman, its object being not to give her any superiority over other good and chaste women but to refute the charge of unchastity brought against her by the Jews. Similarly, there is a tradition which says that Jesus and his mother are free from the touch of Satan. It is absurd to take these words to mean that the other prophets are not free from the contact of devil. The words are plainly meant to refute the charges of impurity and unchastity against Jesus and his mother of which the Jews declared them guilty. The super-

naturalness in the birth of Jesus is not a proof of his Divinity. To dispel all doubts, both the Holy Quran and the Gospel relate the stories of the birth of Jesus and John in one place. By relating both stories in the same breath, it is intended to signify that though in the birth both of Jesus and of John, there is a supernatural element, yet neither of them becomes a God thereby. For if one of them, *viz.*, Jesus can claim Divinity on account of his supernatural birth, the other, *viz.*, John, has as much right to it on the same grounds. Both these births were in fact a sign that the gift of Divine revelation was departing from the house of Israel. For, Jesus had no Israelite father, and the parents of John were not in a condition to beget children. Both these prophets, the last links in the chain of Israelite prophets, were in a way cut off from the house of Israel and their separation was an indication that glory had departed from Israel and that the Divine gift of prophecy was going to be transferred to another house. Jesus notwithstanding that he was a prophet for the Israelites, was not himself an Israelite for he had no Israelite father, and this was an allusion to the departure of the gift of prophecy from the house of Israel for evermore.

All these considerations prove conclusively that there is not a single circumstance in the birth and the miracles of Jesus lending any support to the allegation of his Divinity. It is with this object that Almighty God has related the story of the supernatural birth of John along with that of Jesus, for if John remains a mortal notwithstanding his supernatural birth, Jesus cannot claim Divinity on this ground. In fact, the element of supernaturalness in the birth of John, is by no means weaker than that in the birth of Jesus. In one respect it has a greater force. In the first place, in the birth of Jesus the supernatural element exists on the side of the male parent only whereas in the birth of John it exists on the side of both parents. Secondly, the sign of the birth of John has not been obscured by any circumstance. Unchastity was never imputed to John's mother, nor is such a charge possible for she was barren. But the charge of unchastity brought against Mary has cast the extraordinariness of the birth of Jesus into the shade. The charge is no doubt a false one, but Mary herself made a mistake which gave rise to the scandalous imputation. When the angel came to her in a vision and gave her the glad tidings that she

was with a child, she did not mention the vision to any one and kept the whole matter a secret. The reason of the fear displayed by Mary was that her parents had made a vow before God to dedicate her for the service of the holy temple at Jerusalem. This vow of her parents Mary had strengthened by her own covenant that she will not know man till her death, and shall remain in the service of the temple her whole life. When she saw the vision that a son shall be born to her, she feared to disclose it lest the people should think that she was making pretences for getting married. But the vision was true and Mary was actually with a child. The fact could not be concealed long. In the earlier stage of pregnancy, the matter remained a secret but in an advanced stage this was not possible. About the fifth month the fact was disclosed and then Mary mentioned her vision. But it was too late and at last to cast a veil over the whole matter, she was hastily married to an old man and the sign of the birth of Jesus was thus obscured.

The prophecies of Jesus have always been ridiculed by the Jews. The occurrence of events which are every day witnessed in the world such as earthquakes, famines and wars has been made the subject of solemn predictions. The Jews also say that his prophecies all turned out to be false, and the Christians have not yet answered their objections. For instance, Jesus had promised to the twelve apostles whom he was addressing that they shall go to heaven and that they shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. But the number was even in the life-time of Jesus reduced to eleven, and Judas, the "son of perdition," who betrayed his master for the paltry sum of thirty half-crowns, was everlastingly lost. Instead of heaven he went into hell, and it is difficult to see how he will be allowed to take his seat on a throne. Had this prophecy of Jesus been from God, Judas would not have apostatized. Jesus had also emphatically declared that his return was to be so speedy that the generation of people then before him shall not pass away before he came back in glory? This prophecy has also been clearly falsified. Generation after generation has passed away and nearly 2000 years have elapsed, but he has not still appeared.

All these things prove conclusively that he was utterly destitute

of power. He was not a God but only a weak human being, and human weakness and ignorance clung to him. The Gospels show that he had no knowledge of the unseen. He ran to a fig tree to satisfy his hunger, and he did not know that the fig tree bore no fruit. He also confessed his ignorance of the day of judgment. Had he been God, he ought to have known it. In short, he did not possess a single attribute of Divinity; nor had he any qualification to the exclusion of all other mortals. The Christians further admit that he died. Sad indeed is the lot of the people whose God dies. To say that he rose again, is no comfort. What reliance can be placed upon the life of him who showed by his death that he was subject to death and not beyond the reach of its wasting hand.

These few remarks are sufficient to convince every reasonable mind that the Christian religion in its present form is not the religion of the true God, for the person whom they look upon as their God cannot be a God. God cannot die, nor can God be ignorant of the future and the unseen.

ARYA SAMAJIC TEACHINGS IN RELATION TO GOD.

We shall take the Arya Samaj next and see if it believes in the one, true, living and perfect God. Now the first requisite of a belief in God is the admission of the Divine unity in His person and attributes, and the exclusion of all other beings and creatures from every Divine excellence. But the Arya Samajists consider all existence as co-eternal with God. Again, as the existence of God is not due to any other being, the Arya Samajists hold that soul and matter also do not owe their existence to any creator, but that they are like God eternal and self-existing with all their various properties and faculties. This belief, it is clear, deals a death-blow to the unity, majesty and glory of God, and must, therefore, be condemned. This pernicious belief has also the effect of negativing every argument for the existence of God. The maker can be known from what he has made, but if both soul and matter were never made by God and are eternal and self-existing, the existence of God cannot be proved. If God is not needed for creating soul and matter, He is not needed for anything else.

To say that God is recognised by the manufacturing work which is done by Him and by the combination which He brings about between soul and body, is the veriest nonsense. Manufacturing unattended with the power of creation is no proof of Divinity, and if it is, every artisan and manufacturer deserves to be called a God. The wonderful modern inventions of Europe and America shall then have to be classed on a par with the manufactures of God. They show the same ability of working existing material into new forms as God is by the Aryas believed to have shown in making the existing universe.

The one distinguishing characteristic of the power of God is His power of creating the properties, forces, faculties, &c., which are found to exist in matter and soul. For instance, He has given eyes to all living beings, but His inimitable Divine power is not displayed in the fashioning of the eye-balls in the form in which they are, but in creating the properties and powers in the media and nerves which produce vision. But if the properties of matter and soul are self-existent and not created by God, God is nothing because vision is the result of these powers. Had these properties been wanting, God could not have given the sight. It is clear from this that the Godhead of the Deity consists in His having created the properties of soul and matter and His having planted in them powers which are brought into effect on an arrangement of the parts. It is for this reason that no human inventor can be the equal of God, for he only makes use of the properties and forces of matter but cannot create any property or force in matter. His inventions are the result of certain properties and forces existing in matter, and herein lies his inferiority and powerlessness, because he has not the power to create a property or a force, and such power belongs to God alone. If the power of God were also limited to making use of the properties and forces existing in matter, and not extended to the creation of those properties, He would have no superiority over the inventor of steam-engine, photography or phonograph. The Godhead of the Deity cannot, therefore, be proved unless He is recognised as the creator of the properties of matter and soul, or in other words the creator of matter and soul. The conclusion is irrefut-

able that either God must be recognised as the creator of matter and soul with all their properties, or every artificer must be admitted as the equal of God.

Such is the Arya Samajic doctrine of the unity of God. The next thing we have to consider is how far it attributes power to God. This is also abundantly clear from the above. It is the first principle of the Aaya Samaj that God is neither the creator of souls nor the maker of particles of matter. His power according to them is, therefore, limited to manufacturing and the uniting of souls and bodies. But the rare properties, forces and qualities of matter and souls are self-existing and independent of His power. The power of God has thus been shorn of every glory and greatness and He is brought low to the level of mortals. If matter and soul are self-existent, their properties, forces and qualities which display rare power and exquisite skill are also self-existent and not brought into existence by God. For it cannot be asserted that although matter and soul are eternal and self-existing, yet their properties have been created by God. The existence of a thing means its existence with its properties, and we cannot imagine a thing existing without any property. The properties of matter and soul are inherent and are not the result of combination. All these considerations settle conclusively that if God is not recognised as the creator of souls and matter, His power has no superiority over the power which human beings possess. As they have the power of working existing material into forms and making use of the properties and forces of matter, He also has the same power and no more.

Various considerations show the futility of this view of the limited power of God. Almighty God has created in man the qualities which are necessary to the accomplishment of the Divine object in his creation. For instance, there is in man the quality of love which though sometimes misdirected, points unmistakably to the Divine Being as the true object of its love. The quality of love implanted in the soul of man leads him to love his Master with all his heart and all his soul and with deep and sincere devotion. At its bidding a man is ready to forsake everything, ready even to sacrifice his life. Can we say that this mighty impulse of love which rules the heart

is an inherent property of the eternal soul with which God has nothing to do ? If Almighty God has not with His own hand established this relation of love between Himself and man and created the quality of love in his soul for this particular purpose, we shall have to attribute only to a chance this good fortune of the Almighty that the souls had inherently in them a quality of love. If it had so happened that the souls had not possessed the inherent quality of love, no man would have ever thought of God, and God Himself would have been quite helpless in the matter for He could not have brought into existence a quality which did not exist. When, on the other hand, we consider the generally recognised principle that every one shall be called to account for not obeying the call of God, we have to admit that the properties of obedience and love in soul have been created by God Himself. It is for this reason that He requires man to love, and to submit to, Him, for He has given him the power to do so. On any other supposition it is difficult to account for the submission to Divine will which God requires of us. Now the relation of love between man and God is a relation of mutual attraction such as exists between man and man or among animals of the same kind. But such a relation is inconceivable in the very nature of things if the physical and spiritual powers of man have not emanated from the hand of God and are not dependent upon Him. The mere circumstance that God united the soul with the body can, in no way, bring about the deep relation of mutual love, for the manufacturer does not acquire any such close connection with the thing manufactured.

On account of the deep relation which exists between the soul of man and the Author of its existence, Almighty God has been metaphorically called Father in the sacred books. The Quran also says: فاذكروا الله كذكركم ابائكم "Remember God as you remember your fathers," and again الله نور السموات والارض "God is the true light, from whom every light in heaven and earth has emanated." The use of the metaphorical expression Father for God and describing Him as the source of every light, are facts which plainly indicate that a strong mutual relation exists between the soul of man and his heavenly master. In Arabic man is called

انسان (*insan*) *i.e.*, having a two-fold love, a love for God and a love for his fellow-beings. In Hindi, he is called مانس *manas* which is an abbreviated form of the Arabic word مانوس *manus*, *i.e.*, one in whose nature love has been implanted. The error of idol-worship is also really the result of a search after God which on account of the narrowness of knowledge seeks relief from the Infinite and the Invisible in definite and visible objects as representations of the Deity. With a full knowledge of, and a clear insight into, the deep relation which exists between God and man, I assert it forcibly that the Arya Samajic doctrine of the eternity and self-existence of soul and matter is an absolutely false and a pernicious doctrine which strikes at the root of the mutual relations of love. The doctrine is an innovation of Pandit Daya Nand and we cannot say how far its origin can be traced in the Vedas. At any rate, the doctrine owned by the orthodox Hindu sect of Sanatan Dharma is more reasonable, though it too has been distorted by long subjection to the erroneous principles of the Vedanta. Notwithstanding this, the rays of the light of truth still shine forth from underneath the mass of error. The essence of this doctrine is simply this that everything has emanated from the hands of God. From this we see that according to the Sanatan Dharamists the Vedas teach the doctrine that matter and soul with all their forces and properties have been brought into existence by God.

It is of the utmost importance to remember that the ancient Hindu faith which is professed by millions of the people of this country, is Sanatan Dharma. Though the original purity of this religion has been greatly marred by the fatuous beliefs of the ignorant masses, such as worship of idols, setting up gods with God and the deifying of great and good men, still if the extraneous matter were removed and orroneous doctrines set aside, a great many religious truths would be discovered in this time-honored creed. In it there have been a great many *rishis*, *munis* and *yogis*, men who have spent their whole lives in devotion and meditation. But the religion presented by Swami Daya Nand has far less spirituality than the Sanatan Dharma, though the latter too has now lost its spirituality by mingling with the truth many erroneous doctrines, such

as idle-worship, &c. The truth is that man cannot have a close connection with the Almighty Being or attain to a life of true spirituality, if God is not the author of his existence. How can he attain to oneness with God who is quite foreign to the Almighty and owes nothing to Him? I have heard from learned Pandits of the Sanatan Dharma that the theory of the eternity of soul and matter has been borrowed by Pandit Daya Nand from metaphysicians, who were guided by their own imperfect reason and not by the Vedas in their religious speculations. But as the object of Pandit Daya Nand was to found a popular Hindu sect, he resorted to the Vedas and distorted its words to support his own theories. In fact the Vedas lend no support to his assertion and their teaching is the same as is still discovered beneath the superstitions of the Sanatan Dharma. There were men in ancient India whose practical lives were worthy of praise. Among them were ascetics who spent their lives in meditation and devotion in jungles. In their hearts was humbleness and purity, for their religion did not consist simply in professing with the tongue. They purified their hearts and desired it with true earnestness and zeal that God should be a reality to them and that they should see His shining face in this world. For this noble object they exercised very hard and the light of this sincerity shone from their foreheads. Then came a time when the worship of idols, gods goddesses and incarnations and everything else which could attract attention, took the place of the purity of heart, and the ways were quite forgotten by walking in which Rama and Krishna had attained to righteousness and God had revealed Himself to them.

It is a fact that the people who become God's and consider Him as the Author of their existence and of every particle of their body, are blessed with Divine favors on account of their complete submission to the Divine will, but those who consider their souls and the particles of their body as having come into existence independently of God have vanity and haughtiness in their hearts and they are in fact deniers of His great and abundant goodness and of His perfect Lordship. According to their teachings Almighty God has not even that connection with man which a father has spiritually with his son. They admit that the son on account of his close spiri-

tual connection with his father partakes of his morals, and that the courage, intelligence, &c., of the father are inherited by the son, but they deny that the morals, qualities and powers of the human soul have been granted to him by God, for then they shall have to confess that matter and soul have been created by God. The truth is that the morals of man are an image of the Divine morals, for when God created the souls, His morals were imaged in man in the same manner as the morals of a father are imaged in his son.

We have already stated that God created in the soul of man powers adapted to His love and worship and hence the powerful attraction with which a man is drawn towards God. The powers which God Himself has given to the soul, hear the voice of God. In a like manner, as it was the will of God that man should be perfect in the Divine knowledge, He created in the human soul the qualities suited for the attainment of such knowledge. In fact, every property of the human soul has been planted in it by the hand of God, and the qualities of the human soul are only images of the Divine attributes. No quality of the soul is in itself hateful; it is the abuse of it that is to be condemned. If it be said that there are many detestable qualities in the human soul, such as vengeance, jealousy, &c., and that these certainly cannot have been planted by the hand of God, nor can they possibly be the images of the Divine attributes, the reply is that not the quality itself but only its misuse is pernicious. If the quality is called forth into action on the proper occasion, it is a virtue, but if it is displayed on the wrong occasion, it becomes a vice. The qualities of the human soul are all images of the Divine attributes, but man has the power to use them either to a good or to a bad end. Envy for instance is a base passion and a quality to be condemned but envy is really a misuse of the quality of jealousy, which aims at attaining the highest excellence to which no one else should be able to attain. To repine at the good which another has and to wish that he should be deprived of it, is a misuse of the innate desire of superiority. The quality of jealousy planted in human nature by the hand of God is, therefore, an admirable quality and an image of the Divine attribute of jealousy, for He too does not like that any one else should be

His partner or equal. A person may deserve our praise or hatred according to the motive which sets the quality in motion. If he has a burning desire for excelling all men in spirituality and in his close connection with God, he is to be admired, but if he sickens at the sight of the good which others enjoy and wishes that they should be deprived of it, he is to be hated.

We have thus seen that it is an absurdity to limit the power of God to some actions and to deny it in others. There is another consideration which renders a belief in the Almightiness of God necessary. If God is not Omnipotent, our hope in Him is vain. The acceptance of our prayers depends upon the absolute power of God to generate in the soul or the body of a person a power which does not exist already. When we pray for a sick person who is dying to all appearance, we entreat the Almighty Being to create in him a power that should resist the power of death. We frequently see such prayers accepted. At first we plainly see that the symptoms are all fatal, and that the energy of life is all wasted, but when our entreaties and prayers are offered to God with pressing solicitation, and we are exceedingly sorrowful and greatly afflicted for the sake of the dying one, and dead to all besides God, suddenly the word of God brings the glad tidings of his restoration to health and the signs of life once more begin to appear, and he is as it were raised from the dead.

I remember that when the plague raged heavy all around us, I prayed to God to protect us from this affliction and to engender in our bodies a prophylactic property which should counteract the effect of the poison of the plague. This prayer was accepted and Almighty God revealed to me that I would be saved from the plague and that all those would also be saved who while living within the four walls of my house did not show any vanity or arrogance (*i. e.*, who rebelled not against the commandments of God and His messenger) but led righteous lives and conformed their conduct to my teachings. He also told me that the town of Qadian would be saved from destructive plague and protected from such a severe outbreak of it as might cause a panic or depopulate the town. So we have seen the truth of these words and witnessed the fulfilment of the promise of God. Such is the powerful

God who is our God. His attribute of creation is ever at work, and He is always creating new things and new powers and properties in the universe. Previous to the present outbreak no one can trace any sign of the plague in the Punjab during the last five hundred years. The plague bacilli have been created now and they shall disappear when it shall be the pleasure of God to bring them to destruction. This shall be a sign for every Arya that we did not resort to inoculation, for such was the injunction of God, and although many a man who got inoculated has become the morsel of death, we are still alive by the grace of God. Thus does God create matter as He created in our bodies the panacean particles, and thus does He create souls as He breathed into me the pure soul which gave me life. We are not only dependent upon Him for the soul which enlivens the body, but the animal soul itself stands in need of another soul which gives an everlasting life to the first soul. Both these souls are created by God and he who has not known this secret is ignorant of God and unaware of His power.

We shall next consider the Aryan doctrine as to the knowledge of God. Reason requires that God should be Omniscient, that He should know the unseen and the unknown, that there should be nothing hid from Him but that His knowledge should comprehend all. The Aryas however preach a God who has no knowledge of the hidden powers and properties of matter and soul. His knowledge takes Him no further than this that every property, power or excellence that He sees in any living being is due to its deeds done in a previous birth. Had He known that apart from their connection with the living bodies, the souls have any inherent property or excellence, He would have assigned a previous birth to them instead of supposing them to be eternal. It is evident that the property of a thing must be inseparably connected with its subject. Supposing that the human soul can pass into an ass's body, it shall still retain its inherent qualities whether they are manifested in the new form or not. For if with a change of body the attributes of the soul are made extinct, they can never be renewed, for creation out of nothing is impossible according to the Aryan belief. It would appear from this that transmigration does not annihilate any property of the soul; in other words, the properties of the soul remain unaffected when the soul completes its revolution of trans-

migration. But if the qualities of the soul do not undergo a change as the soul passes through diffrent bodies, it follows that the properties of the soul are not subject to transmigration. Therefore, if God has not the power to subject the properties of the soul to transmigration, the conclusion is inevitable that He has no knowledge of the secret powers and hidden properties of the soul, nor is He aware how the souls came to possess these attributes and powers.

Again if God has a perfect knowledge of the nature of the soul and is fully aware of its properties and powers, the question must still be solved why He is unable to make the soul. The Aryas believe the number of souls to be limited and the period of their revolution in different bodies to be a definite period. Why is God then unable to create what is limited both in time and number? And who has set these limits if God has not? How can the knowledge of God with respect to souls be as perfect as that of the maker of a thing with respect to what his hands have made? How can the two be equal in knowledge of a thing, he who has made it and he who cannot make it or its like? It is unquestionable that the minute and precise knowledge of a thing possessed by the maker of it, is not possessed by any one else, though he may be under the impression that he has such knowledge. A veil of ignorance hangs before our knowledge of things which have not been made by us. For instance, we think that as we see bread cooked every day, we are well-acquainted with the art of making it. Yet we will discover if we actually try to make it that our presumed knowledge of making bread is very defective. In the same manner, we can easily see with what skill a surgeon can perform the most delicate operations, remove the calculi from the kidneys, deal with the most intricate series of considerations in operating upon the cranial regions, reach even the abdominal cavity and treat the wound of the peritoneum, and excise the eye with a sharp knife in cases of cataract. If an ignorant man were called upon to perform any one of these operations, he would certainly put an end to the life of the patient. The difference between the two is a difference of knowledge. The physician has a precise knowledge of physiology and of the relations of the organs to the diseased members and can, therefore, perform the most delicate operation with success, while the ignorant man cannot do any of these things on account of his lack of knowledge. The Aryas shall, therefore, have to confess that God's know-

ledge of things would have been greater and more precise if He had been their creator; in other words, the present knowledge of God is deficient. Moreover, when it is admitted that God is not the Creator of the particles of matter and of their properties, and of souls and of their powers and attributes, the evident conclusion is that He is ignorant of those properties and attributes. Against this natural conclusion from admitted facts, it is useless to assert that though God is not the Creator, yet He has such knowledge, for there is no argument for it. Even supposing for the sake of argument that God has such knowledge to a certain extent, it must be far inferior to that which He would have possessed if the properties and attributes of matter and soul had been the work of His hands, for no sensible person can deny that the knowledge of a third person must be deficient in comparison with the knowledge of the maker of a thing. Against this pernicious belief with regard to the person and attributes of God, the Holy Quran teaches the noble doctrine that Almighty God is a perfect knower of the hidden powers and properties of matter and soul. This perfect knowledge of God relating to the inmost secrets of the heart of things, teaches the word of God, is owing to His being their Maker and Creator. But the God presented by the Vedas is silent as to any arguments for His asserted knowledge of things and the only fact known about Him, *viz.*, that He is not the Creator of things, rebuts any such presumption. For us, not only the Quran bears witness and gives arguments as to the perfect knowledge of God, but there is also the source of fresh revelations from God which not only reveal to us His knowledge of the secrets but also make us witness His power. But the door of revelation is fastened close upon the Aryas. They have, therefore, no means left to come to a certain conclusion that their God is the knower of secrets or the possessor of absolute and unlimited power, neither do the Vedas give them the glad tidings that any one of them shall ever attain to certainty in these respects.

In a like manner, the Aryas hold the doctrine that a perfect excellence is not attributable to their God in the bestowal of His favors upon mortals. They believe that He grants salvation only for a limited time, and when it has elapsed He sends them back to the world to pass through the same transmigratory states, though there

is no fault on their part. The law according to which He deals punishment and mercy is, therefore, intended to serve His own selfish ends, for He knows that if everlasting salvation is granted to souls, the course of transmigration shall cease and He shall be divested of His power over them and shall have to sit idle for evermore. For, the Aryas hold that the number of souls is limited, and, therefore, the law of granting perpetual salvation to the good ones shall by and by diminish the number of souls suffering transmigration, with the ultimate result that all the souls having obtained salvation, God shall be left without a single soul to rule upon. Nor can the defect of the lessening of souls be made up by the creation of new ones, for God according to the Aryan doctrine has not the power to create a single soul. The inability to create new souls, therefore, obliges Him to hold back the gift of perpetual salvation from men, and as a security against His own loss of power, He recurs to the expedient of submitting to disgrace even those whom He has once seated on the throne of glory and honor by granting them salvation. Pity the poor souls that on account of God's lack of power, they have thus to suffer the disgrace of going through detestable forms without any fault on their part. These cannot be the doings of a great and beneficient God. But the Aryas actually believe that God has often granted salvation to all the souls, and again expelled them from the salvation-house to undergo every sort of disgrace.

This doctrine of temporary salvation has to face another very serious objection which we have not as yet seen answered by the Aryas. If, as they hold, God deprives the souls of the salvation which He has granted them, to serve his own selfish ends, and sends them back to the world in different forms, He gives preference to some over others though they have done nothing to deserve it. Upon the termination of one cycle of transmigration, the souls are all on a level and on account of their righteousness have all been granted salvation. But when the new cycle begins, these souls are all sent back to the world in different forms. One is sent back as a man, another as a woman, a third is made a cow, a fourth is turned into a dog, a fifth is changed into a monkey, a sixth becomes a swine, a seventh is metamorphosed into a wolf, and so on, the endless diversity of forms being filled up with the different souls. Now this process

involves the greatest injustice, especially when each soul had to labor hard for millions of years in different forms of body for getting the boon of salvation. Even if it is deemed undeserving of enjoying this boon for ever, it should have at least been favored with a human body and not turned into the disgraceful form of a dog or a swine. This injustice becomes the greater when we see that another soul who also has earned the same salvation in the same manner is made a man. What is it but grave injustice that of two men who stand on the same level of salvation and to neither of whom it is the gift of God, one is favored with a human body and the other punished with the body of a dog. Punishment and mercy in this case are marked by cruelty and injustice.

There is another serious objection against this theory of temporary salvation. The rule of sending back the souls that have once attained salvation to be subjected to the lowest and basest forms of disgrace repuires that even the godly and sacred leaders of the Hindu religion should be no exception to it. We are sorry even to put forward this objection which is a natural consequence of the Aryan doctrine of salvation. Far be it from us to attribute any disgrace to the sacred leaders of any religion, for we believe that no person whom Almighty God has out of His bountiful mercy once granted a full measure of His love, knowledge and pure connection, and whom He has included among His honored servants, is ever subjected to any sort of disgrace by Him, and that no one who has once attained the nearness of God, can ever be so farther off from Him as dogs and monkeys are. But this hideous doctrine is the direct consequence of the Arya Samajic theory which throws even the *rishis* and *munis* into the transmigratory state. We, therefore, wish in all earnestness to be enlightened upon the point whether the four *rishis* to whom the Vedas are said to have been revealed, and such great persons as Rama and Krishna whom the Hindus believe to be the incarnations of the Deity, are exceptions to the rule of temporary salvation. If they are, we will like to know the reasons for which they are excepted, and if not, then why are their names held in such great honor and reverence? Is it compatible with reason to revere a book and to look upon it as the word of God but to consider the person upon whom it descended as going through every form of disgraceful birth. We shall be guilty

of grave disrespect and arrogance to God if we ascribe to Him this absurdity that He turns His honored servants into dogs and swine. He never turns to impurity the holy ones whom He has Himself purified. Such are the serious objections to which the theory of temporary salvation is open, and according to this law no sacred leader of the Hindu religion is worthy of honor, for it is not known in what disgraceful transmigratory state he at present is. The God presented by this doctrine is not only exposed to the charge of niggardliness on account of His withholding the gift of permanent salvation, but He is also hard-hearted, unjust and revengeful, inasmuch as He turns into dogs and monkeys even those of His faithful servants who loved Him with a true heart, sacrificed themselves in His path and chose Him above everything else throughout their lives. Can any good be expected from such a Lord and Master?

The Arya Samajists hold that the Vedas inculcate the worship, not of the physical forces of nature, but of the one true God. Against this monotheistic view of the teachings of the Vedas, which is held by a very small minority of the Hindu religion, the Sanatan Dharma which prevails throughout India and is professed by an overwhelming majority of the followers of the Vedas, strongly asserts that the Vedas teach us in plain words, that we should worship fire, wind, water, earth, sun, moon, &c. The general tendency of the Hindus from the very earliest times has been to worship the force of nature, and as in old times even now millions of them worship the Ganges, ascribe Divine powers to the fire at Jowala Mukhi, and bow down in submission before the rising sun, and all this they do in obedience to the Vedas. Moreover, when we read the Vedas, we find in them a pure nature-worship. Prayers are offered and invocations and sacrificial offerings constantly made to acqueous vapour, fire, wind, sun, storm and the other forces of nature. There is the Water-god or Indra, the greatest of gods and above every creature. *Agni* or the fire-god is constantly invoked and again and again described as the object of worship of all *rishis* from the earliest times, the lord and giver of wealth and children and as the god who takes the sacrificial offerings to other gods and intercedes with them for the worshipper. The moon is invoked to deliver the worshipper from sins and from every other difficulty and is described as equal in rank with the fire-god. The sun is invoked as the most beautiful

of gods. The earth is also invoked as a god to give the worshipper true bliss and happiness. The four Vedas are full of such invocations and praises addressed to gods in the skies, in air and on earth. Hymn after hymn runs in the same strain and there is not the slightest trace of the worship of one God. The attributes of the Deity such as "Lord of creatures," "all-doer" are all ascribed to particular gods.

Form these facts a reflecting mind can easily come to the conclusion that the Vedas plainly teach a worship of elements and do not make the slightest pretension to a comprehension of the Divine unity. Against this, Pandit Daya Nand asserts that the gods of fire, earth, wind, &c., invoked in the Vedas are only different descriptions of the one Divine Being. Even this assertion for which he has offered no arguments, he has been unable to maintain to the last. He admits that in many places fire, water and the other gods actually mean the same and not God. The fact is that Pandit Daya Nand was not putting a new interpretation upon the plain words of the Vedas, but actually making new Vedas. He did not claim to be inspired nor was he ever able to explain his authority for his unnatural interpretation of the Vedic hymns. His mind was not illumined by the light of Divine revelation, nor did any heavenly sign appear in support of his contention. As a Pandit he was only one out of thousands and had no superiority in any respect over the numerous Pandits who for hundreds of years have been explaining the Vedic hymns as inculcating the worship of the diverse forces of nature. The Muhammadans are not alone in ascribing nature-worship to the Vedas. Millions of Hindus who stick to the oldest form of Hinduism hold the same. We cannot conceive thousands of Pandits remaining blind to the monotheistic teachings of the Vedas generation after generation and misrepresenting them as teaching the worship of natural forces. Hymn after hymn runs in the same strain, and the person who sits down to explain away every hymn of element-worship as a monotheistic doctrine weaves ropes of sand. Had any portion of the Vedas been free from the invocation of the elements of nature as gods, there would have been some excuse for an attempt to distort the plain and natural signification of their hymns.

The Arya Samajists are possessed with the notion that Pandit Daya Nand alone understood the true meaning of the words of the Vedas which never occurred to thousands of Pandits from the earliest times that the Vedas existed. But it is sufficiently clear that Daya Nand has no right to be the sole exponent of the Vedas. The Sanatan Dharma condemns the unnatural interpretations resorted to by the founder of the Arya Samaj. The Brahmos also interpret the words of the Vedas in the same manner as the orthodox Hindus. Add to these considerations the fact that the translations of the Vedas by learned and eminent scholars quite free from every sort of religious prejudice, uphold the view of the Sanatan Dharma. In the face of the agreement of these three different classes as to the true interpretation of the Vedas, it is simply extravagant to assert that they have all been unable to comprehend the true meaning of the words and that the credit of having discovered it belongs solely to Pandit Daya Nand. The Arya Samajic contention is plainly false, and in one way only it can claim our consideration. We have shown above that in the Vedas, fire, water, &c., are plainly invoked, addressed as gods, regarded as possessors of all power, above all creatures, deliverers from difficulties and sins, and possessors of the Divine attributes, and all prayers are addressed to them and them only. If the Arya Samajists succeed in showing that there are hymns in the Vedas clearly forbidding the worship of fire, wind, &c., and enjoining the worship of the one true God, we shall have then to consider which of the hymns must be explained away, whether those enjoining the worship of elements or those forbidding it. But a considerable number of such verses must be produced, for on the strength of one or two verses we cannot question the plain meaning of the hundreds of verses containing invocations to the natural forces. The strong and prominent feature of Vedic worship is nature-worship, and rare allusions to Divine unity if any such exist, may be due to later interpolations. Unless the Arya Samaj succeeds in pointing out a considerable number of verses clearly forbidding the worship of every thing besides God and leaving no doubt as to the true object of Vedic adorations, a thousand Daya Nands cannot alter the meaning of plain words. Millions of human beings have been led astray by the Vedas in every age and in the face of this ostensible fact witnessing to the

truth of the element-worship in the Vedas, the mere assertion of Pandit Daya Nand or of any other single commentator cannot carry any weight, especially when the majority of the commentators are all agreed upon the contrary significance. Pandit Daya Nand, moreover, does not assert that Almighty God revealed to him the significance which he gives to the words of the Vedas. It is possible that he may have felt an aversion to the polytheistic teachings of the Vedas, and, therefore, interpreted them in a particular manner for the promulgation of his own opinions, without robbing the Vedas of their sanctity and authority. Where there are contentious opinions as to the significance of certain words, the decision must naturally be on the side which carries the greater weight. We cannot ignore the evidence of thousands of Pandits, nor treat lightly the testimony offered by the practice of millions of men for hundreds of years. It was the duty of the Vedas to express themselves in a manner which should have rightly guided their followers in the most essential principle of the true object of adoration. When they contain numerous verses which have by their teaching of polytheism led astray millions of human beings, they ought to have contained at least a hundred verses plainly forbidding the worship of anything besides God, if such was ever their object. Why do they not lay the same stress upon the worship of one God as they lay upon that of the forces of nature. A few inferences forced from the words of the Vedas, and contradicting their general tenor, cannot avail.

There is another point to which the Holy Quran directs our attention and we note it here for the full understanding of the subject under discussion. It is also possible that the same may be the object of the hymns of the Rigveda and after the lapse of a long time it may have been lost sight of. At the same time we do not think it impossible that in the Rigveda hymns forbidding the worship of everything besides God may have abounded, but when with the lapse of time, the number of those who relying on the ostensible meaning of the hymns turned to nature-worship increased, the monotheistic teachings may have been expunged from the Vedas. That the Vedas may have undergone such a change we do not deny, but to prove it, it would be necessary to show that some hymns were actually expunged from the

Vedas at some time. The simple fact that some hymns celebrate the praise of fire and other elements, is not sufficient to rebut the presumption that it is a heavenly book, for on a deeper reflection it would appear that the conception of a supreme Deity, the creator of the universe, is not opposed to such praise. There is no doubt that in the Vedas as we have them there are some hymns which it is very hard to reconcile with the worship of the true God, but there are others in which, according to the allusions we glean from the Holy Quran, the religious conceptions are pervaded by the existence of an independent power endowed with all the Divine attributes. We should have no hesitation in admitting, if sufficient proof is given, that the Vedas may really have been the advocates of the worship of one God, but that additions and alterations may have been made in them later on which led to their present condition. But as we have them they teem with hymns which teach nothing besides the worship of nature, and it is the result of their injurious teachings that millions of human beings have been led astray to worship fire and other things. Even the fire-worship of the Parsees and the polytheism of Greece and Rome may be traced to the Vedic teachings, if there is any truth in the Arya Samajic assertion that the Veda is the oldest book. Taking this assertion as true, the Vedas shall have to be regarded as the root from which many evil doctrines grew up in different countries. All the four Vedas are at present quite devoid of the truth of Divine unity, and every page of them is full of the worship of the physical forces. The human worship inculcated in the four Gospels and the worship of natural forces enjoined in the four Vedas, are two rather astonishing facts which may lead one to think that the number four bears some particular relation to polytheism. But the resemblance does not seem to have ended here. It seems probable that like the Gospel which originally inculcated the worship of one true God, the Vedas may also have contained hymns forbidding the worship of the sun, moon, fire, water, earth and other things. And although the alterations have done them lasting harm, yet we are led to think that originally they may not have been so useless. Any one who is acquainted with the history of Hindus so far as it can be learned, will see that the Vedas have undergone great changes and revolutions. At one time they were burned in fire, and

for a long time they remained in the possession of persons who were addicted to idolatry and element-worship. For a long time none but the Brahmans were entitled to read them. At such a time it was possible for their depositaries to effect the desired change in them and many teachings inculcating the worship of elements may have been added by them.

Many facts however tend to prove that the worship of the forces of nature instead of one God, has ever been the religion of the Hindus. For seven centuries the country remained in the possession of the Muslims and during this long period they saw the Hindus worshipping anything but God. The Hindu infatuation for the cow may also be traced to the same root. It is nearly thirteen hundred years when a part of India was subjugated by the Muslim conquerors, and even at that distant period, they saw nothing but idol worship and fire-worship in this country. As far back as history can take us, nothing but nature-worship and idol-worship can be discovered. The Aryas still bewail the fate of those who were converted to Islam during the ascendancy of Muslim power and ascribe such conversions to compulsion, thus indicating that their hearts still cling to idol-worship though with their lips they profess the unity of God. The fabrication of the story of Haqiqat Rai who is supposed to have been murdered by the Muslims for his tenacity to idol-worship, is also due to their zealotry for it. In short, Muslim history for the last thousand years bears witness that India has always during this long interval of time been the centre of idolatry. As far back as we can trace our steps in history, we find India involved in the darkness of idolatry. Who can say that there ever was a time when India with its teeming millions bowed down in worship before the Almighty God in obedience to the injunctions of the Vedas? The temple of Jagannath at Benares and similar other pagodas in different parts of the country, ancient writings such as the Bhagwata, a popular book with the simple old Sanatan Dharmists, and old inscriptions, all concur to prove and declare with a loud voice that India has always been steeped in the vice of idolatry. In fact the evil is so inveterate that nothing short of a true conversion to Islam can uproot it. The worship of the one God was first declared on the Indian soil by the Muslim conquerors, and to this day the

Hindus, more particularly the Arya Samajists, entertain a feeling of determined enmity towards the earlier Muhammadan monarchs for their iconoclasm. In short, the foundation of idolatry seems to have been laid with the Vedas. History leads us no farther, but certain verses of the Holy Quran suggest an interpretation of the Vedic hymns which leads one to think that the celebration of the praises of the natural forces may have some other significance than the worship of those things. But this interpretation is only allowable if it is shown that the Vedas contain hymns expressly forbidding the worship of these things and inculcating the worship of one God.

MUSLIM TEACHINGS IN RELATION TO GOD AND AN INTERPRETATION OF THE VEDIC HYMNS.

The interpretation of the Vedic hymns to which attention has been called above, is the result of a deep reflection on certain verses of the Holy Quran. The first of these is the first verse of the Fatiha, the opening chapter of the holy book. It says الحمد لله رب العلمين "All praise is due to God whose sustenance is at work in all the worlds," *i.e.*, in every form, in every phenomenon and through all His handiworks. In other words, only one hidden power whose name is Allah (God) is working beneath everything that conduces to the sustenance, protection, comfort and perfection of the people of this world. For instance the sun has a certain function in contributing to the welfare of the world. It gives heat to the body and thus keeps up the whole system by the circulation of blood, and by giving light it assists the light in the human eye. But the real sun, the real source of heat and light, is God, for it is His power that works in the visible sun. The real sun does not, however, only provide for the well-being and safety of the physical system by working under the apparent source of heat and light, but also for the spiritual well-being of mankind by choosing one man whose position and function with respect to the whole body of men is the same as that of the heart with respect to the human body. He makes him as an instrument for furnishing

spiritual food to other men to whom he stands in the relation of the heart to other members of the body. In him works the Divine power as it works in the sun, and that which he borrows from the great source he deals out to those who are dependent upon him, according to their capacities. As the visible sun gives light to the eyes and brings into view the paths distinguishing the right from the wrong, the spiritual sun opens the heart's eye and takes it to the eminence of true knowledge. In fact the different aspects of the spiritual sun resemble those of the visible. The different functions of the sun, the ripening and sweetening of the fruits, the disinfection of noxious matter, the hanging of green mantles of new leaves and blooms on trees, in spring and loading them with flowers and fruits, and denuding them of their garbs in the autumn with the exception of some ever-green plants, have all their spiritual representatives. The source of spiritual light and spiritual blessings, shows his different aspects in the same manner as the visible source of apparent light. With one of his manifestations he brings the spring and with another autumn. With this he makes a clean sweep of the corrupt matter of unbelief and transgressions, and with that creates the bliss of true knowledge in the hearts of those who recognise him. The visible sun is, therefore, only a symbol of the spiritual sun. But the real source of light is not only the spiritual sustainer of the world; His power works also in the visible sun.

This point is beautifully illustrated in the Holy Quran. There was a Queen named Bilqis who was with her people a worshipper of the sun. The prophet of that time sent her word, saying that she should come and surrender herself to him, and that otherwise he would invade her country with forces which she would not be able to withstand. She obeyed the order of the prophet, but before she set out from her city, Solomon (for he was the Prophet at that time) commanded a palace to be built against her arrival. The pavement of the palace was of bright crystal and under the crystal flowed a broad stream of water. When the Queen arrived, she was asked to enter the palace-yard. When she approached, she saw water running with great force and fishes swimming in it. She, therefore, bared her legs by lifting up her robe to pass through it. Then the prophet

told her that she was mistaken, and that the water was flowing only beneath the floor of glasses and what she saw before her was this floor. There the Holy Quran says: قَالَ إِنَّهُ صَرْحٌ مُمَرَّدٌ مِنْ قَوَارِيرَ "He said, this is a palace evenly floored with glass and the water is flowing beneath it." Then she saw that she had taken the glass for water and was thus warned of the error of her belief. She saw clearly that she was wrong in worshipping the sun as her Lord and that the true God was He whose power was working in the sun. She renounced her old belief even there and accepted the one true God Her eyes were opened and she saw that the supreme power which was the real object of adoration was the power that worked in the forces of nature, and that the sun and other heavenly bodies themselves were only outward semblances through which the power of God worked. Thus did the prophet convince her of the error of adoring things under which a higher power worked, and this power it was which deserved to be worshipped.

The moon which like the sun has been made an object of worship does not possess any power independently of God. Her powers are only manifestations of certain Divine attributes. The moon brightens the terrible darkness of the nights. When it shines, it drives away the darkness before it. Its rising presents a wonderful scene. With the appearance of its rim, darkness begins to vanish away. Similarly when God shines upon those who being involved in darkness and impurities incline to Him, they are purified and brightened as the dark night is brightened by the shining of the moon. Moreover, as moon rises sometimes in the first part of the night, at others at midnight or in the last part of it, so with men. To some Almighty God reveals His shining face in early age, to others in middle age, and there are not a few who see it only in old age. But like the totally dark nights, there are men who come and pass away without a single ray of light beaming upon them. The visible moon is thus a symbol of the real moon. The former has various other functions which are only images of the functions of the latter. As the visible moon has its effect in the physical world, so in the spiritual world the true worshippers of God who is the real moon, are assisted by the grace of God.

Now, physically the system of this world depends upon four kinds of sustenance. The first of these is the heavenly sustenance, *i.e.*, the sustenance afforded by the *akash* from which rain comes and which is thus the source of the physical sustenance of men. When there is a long drought, the water in the earthly strata begins gradually to dry up. The heavenly sustenance afforded by *akash* gives life to the earth and brings new things into existence. The atmosphere or *akash* is, therefore, the first sustainer for it sends down rain. This has been termed Indra in the Vedas. The Holy Quran says والسماء ذات الرجع* "By the heaven (*i.e.*, atmosphere) which sends down rain." In these words Almighty God calls attention to the need of heavenly revelation by citing the evidence of the atmosphere from which rain comes down in time of need. In these few but significant words we are told that our spiritual state stands in need of a water which comes down from heaven, as the rain which is our physical sustainer, also comes down from heaven. Revelation stands in the same relation to human reason as heavenly water does to earthly water. In short the service in which the atmosphere is engaged is an image of the first attribute of God. Almighty God also says that water is the first source of life. This *akash* is the rain-god of the Hindus and is invoked as Indra in the Vedas. But the error consists in supposing, not that Indra or *akash* is really a source of sustenance for mankind, but that it is an independent source of sustenance. The supreme power whosehand works in the *akash*, is God, and, therefore, power and glory belong to Him and not to Indra. The words الحمد لله رب العلمين used in the Holy Quran call attention to this error of the superficial observers who have taken the physical forces of nature for real sustainers of mankind. In the words الحمد لله رب العلمين we are told not to take any one besides God as the actual sustainer of the world. He is the only one God and it is His power which is seen working in the different forces of nature. These words refute the godhead of Indra, for he represents the first great agency through which Divine sustenance is vouchsafed to the world, and to him is given the name of *akash* or sky. To him the idol-worshippers accord the greatest supremacy and greatest honor.

*سماء (ordinarily translated heaven) is in the terminology of the Quran also applicable to the atmosphere which is in Sanskirit *Akash*.

The object of the Holy Quran is to state that the true rain-god is not Indra but God whose power works in bringing down the rain.

In short, the first sustenance afforded by God is wrongly attributed by ignorant and superficial observers to *akash* or Indra. They see the water coming down from *akash* and consider it not as an agency made use of by some higher power but as the power itself which sends down rain, whereas the apparent sustenance of the *akash* is only a shadow of the real sustenance of God, and thunder and lightning are only aspects of the Divine attributes, not the independent powers of *akash*.

The second sort of sustenance afforded by God consists in His *rahmaniyyat*. The word *Rahman* adopted by the Holy Quran is meant to negative the power of the *surya* or sun-god. The worshippers of the physical forces of nature think that as the sky has the power of sending down rain, causing vegetables and plants to grow by its means, so the sun clothes the bare trees in green leaves, decorates them with fine flowers, and loads them with fresh fruits. The sun as it were takes pity on the poverty of the trees which have been denuded in autumn and enriches them with goodly flowers and fruits. In this capacity the sun is a symbol of the mercy or *rahmaniyyat* of God, the second attribute of the Divine Being as described in the Holy Quran.

The third sort of sustenance is provided by God through the moon, which is also an instrument in the nourishment of fruits. The moon is a symbol of the *rahimiyyat* or compassion of God, for as the compassion of God takes by the hand those who are unable to reach the goal by their own efforts, in like manner does the moon promote the growth of, and supply with nutriment, the fruits and ripen them. When the fruits are brought to completion and are ready for gathering, the earth draws them to itself as the owner or the king. The earth is in fact their judge because it values the good fruits and sets great store by them and passes censure on the rotten and bad ones. The earth is thus a symbol of the Divine attribute of judgment, the fourth attribute of God as related in the Holy Quran.

In short the four attributes of God, His sustenance, mercy, compassion and judgment, have been metaphorically ascribed in the Vedas

to the four agencies through which they are manifested. The error of the Vedas consists in attributing to them independent powers and regarding them conscious beings doing work by their own power and will, whereas they are in fact unconscious instruments of Divine power. *Akash*, sun, moon and earth which are the symbols of the four attributes of God, lead a reflecting mind to the great truth that the powers manifested in these four symbols, are really the powers of God and He is the true Lord, the Merciful, the Compassionate and the Judge. But an unthinking mind instead of seeking the hidden truth rests contented with the surface and gives to visible representations the attributes of the power that works in them. It is the exposure of this error which the Holy Quran aims at in its opening chapter. It says: الحمد لله رب العلمين الرحمن الرحيم ملك يوم الدين اياك نعبدو اياك نستعين اهدنا الصراط المستقيم صراط الذين انعمت عليهم غير المغضوب عليهم ولا الضالين۰آمين "Praise, worship and adoration is only for the great Lord whose name is Allah and who is the true sustainer of all the worlds, the All-merciful, the All-compassionate and the Judge of the whole world." So far the *sura* teaches that the right of being the sole object of adoration and glorification belongs to God only, whose sustenance, mercy, compassion and judgeship are not limited to a single sphere and a single world but are displayed in countless varying manifestations beyond the comprehension of man. The *sura* then says "Thee alone do we worship," *i.e.*, since the physical forces have their particular spheres and they do not act as conscious beings, the power working under them being the Divine power, therefore, it is not they that deserve to be worshipped and adored but the great God whose manifestations of unbounded power are unlimited. To the same end the Holy Quran elsewhere says: لا تسجدو للشمس ولا للقمر و اسجدو لله الذى خلقهن "Do not bow down in worship before the sun or before the moon but before God alone who created all these physical forces." It should be noted here that the plural and not the dual pronoun follows the words شمس and قمر, *i.e.*, the sun and the moon, the object being not to reject the worship of the sun and the moon only but of all the forces and objects worshipped by other people. The remaining verses of the *sura* point out in the form of a prayer the advantages which the worshipper of the true God has over the worshippers of fire, the sun,

the moon, the water, &c. The object of this part is to teach that Almighty God grants His manifest and hidden blessings to His true worshippers and reveals Himself to His servants. A man can not know Him by the assistance of his reason only or by the sole guidance of nature, but the all-powerful God makes Himself known by His grand manifestations and mighty powers and wonderful signs. It is He who saves His righteous servants and worshippers when His wrath and anger are kindled against the world ; and it is He who delivers them from error and guides them in the right path by brightening their wisdom and granting them knowledge. This is the substance of the *Sura Fatiha*, the *Sura* which is recited by the Muslims several times in each of the five daily prayers, the *Sura* which is the essence of a Muslim's prayer, nay which is the only true prayer. Unless this *Sura* is repeated with a truly submissive and humble heart when a man is standing in the awful presence of God, and unless through it is sought the object for whose attainment it is taught, the duty of prayer prescribed by Islam is not performed.

Three things have been taught in this prayer. The first of these is a belief in the unity of the person and attributes of God, so that turning his face from the false gods which others have chosen, a man may turn himself wholly to God and resign himself completely to His will, so that his soul may cry out in true emotion ایاک نعبد و ایاک نستعین "O Lord! Thee alone do we worship and adore, and of Thee alone do we seek all assistance." Secondly, this prayer teaches us that our prayer should be addressed to God not for ourselves alone but also for the good and welfare of our brethren. In this manner we are required to perform our duties towards our fellow-beings. The form made use of by the Word of God is اهدنا which means "guide *us* all in the right path" and not "guide *me*" alone. The prayer, therefore, comprises our brethren besides ourselves in the benefits prayed for. The third object for the attainment of which this prayer is taught is that our faith in God and our spiritual condition should not be barren. Hence we are taught to pray for the blessings of God which were granted to the righteous before us. We are also taught to pray that we should not be led into the path of those whom spiritual sight was not granted, and who, therefore, did the wicked deeds which brought down upon them the vengeance and wrath of God even in this world, or who

though saved from punishment in this world died in error and shall be punished in the next. The substance of this prayer is that the person whom God does not grant His spiritual blessings and a spiritual sight which sees the right from the wrong, and whose heart is not filled with the certainty and true knowledge of God's existence, ends his days in destruction and is overtaken by the consuming wrath of God even here on account of his wickedness and transgressions and his abuse of the holy ones of God, an instance of this being met with in the Jews who were punished for their transgressions and destroyed with the plague, or if he refrains from mischief and abuse against the righteous servants of God, he shall be cast into hell after his death because he went astray and did not choose the right path.

In short, it is possible that the hymns and prayers addressed in the Vedas to the various gods, such as Indra, the sun, the moon, the fire, the wind and other physical forces, may have been really meant for the great and supreme power which works and is transcendently present in them all and whose manifestations and agencies all those visible symbols are. It is not simply a guess but we learn it from the Holy Quran that all the bodies and forces to which is assigned any function in the sysetm of this universe are really visible representations and symbols of the names and attributes of the Divine Being. The heavenly bodies and the physical forces of nature are, as it were, the pages of a book, the study of which leads us to a knowledge of the Divine attributes and Divine laws. As an illustration we may mention that the variety of seasons in the phycical world is a symbol of the spiritual changes and revolutions to which men are subject. Corresponding to autumn in which the trees lose their leaves, verdure and freshness, there is the period of spiritual lethargy when the love of God which gives a freshness to the spiritual life of men, is on the wane in human hearts. The true zeal and warmth of faith gradually diminish, though the spiritual sensibilities are not yet quite deadened and open transgression and flagrant sin do not yet prevail. During such a period the world stands on the verge of a spiritual death. A stolid indifference, hardness of heart, and absence of active interest and genuine fervor in religious matters, are the distinguishing characteristics of the spiritual autumn. It is the forerunner of *kaljug*.

Autumn is followed by winter in which coldness is at its height. Corresponding to this season of the year, there is a winter in the spiritual world, when the spiritual sensibilities are numbed and deadened. The love of God vanishes away from hearts and people sleep in ignorance and indifference. God is forsaken, and every one follows his own lust and carnal passions. Drunkenness, gambling, adultery, lying, deceit, cheating, calumniation, vanity, worldliness, dishonesty, bloodshed, mockery, in short every sort of flagrant sin and every form of unblushing immorality abounds and is freely practised. The cleverness of tongue is looked upon as real worth, and the person who can talk cleverly is honored in his life and even after his death. The earth is then like a desert without any living verdure, and there are very few who are pure in heart, pure in words and pure in thoughts, and who fear God and drink at the pure fountain of holy knowledge. This is what is called in Hindi *kaljug*, the iron age, the period that is marked by the dearth of virtue and the supremacy of vice.

Winter is followed by spring when a new life is given to the dead plants, and the dead vegetables again start into growth. In like manner the period of spiritual death and benumbment is followed by a regeneration. New water comes down from heaven to give a new life to the earth. Almighty God chooses one of His servants and makes his heart the reservoir of the life-giving water. From this reservoir the water is supplied to the dead plants and it makes them sprout into the new leaves of the knowledge of God, and blossom into the flowers of His love and at last loads the human branches with fruits of good and righteous deeds.

This is followed by the summer season when the heat of the sun ripens the raw fruits of the spring. Spiritually too, there is a gradual growth in the love of God that has been planted in the human heart, until the heart glows with love and zeal for God, and the spiritual advancement of man reaches its perfection. This is the period known as *satjug*, the golden age, when many men walk in obedience to the commandments of God and resign themselves to His will.

It is clear from the above that the powers physically and temporarily possessed by the heavenly bodies or the physical forces are only images of the eternal and spiritual attributes of the Divine Being.

Almighty God has also revealed to us that the physical forces are not independent powers, it is the mighty power of God which though unseen is working in them all. It is His power which displayed in the moon enlightens the gloomy nights, as He Himself enlightens the heart into which He enters and within which He speaks. It is His power which revealing itself in the sun makes the day a manifestation of glorious light and performs different functions in different seasons. It is His power which being supereminently present in the clouds, sends down rain, and fertilizes the barren land and gives satisfaction to the thirsty. It is His power which being exhibited in fire consumes things. It is His power which in the wind refreshes a man, causes the flowers to blossom, drives the clouds before it and enables the sound to travel. It is His power which being embodied in the form of the earth carries men and animals on its back. But are these things God? Nay, they are the creatures of God, but in them the power of God works in the same manner as the hand works in the pen with which it writes, or as the fire works in the piece of iron which is made red-hot. We say that the pen writes, yet it is not the pen which actually writes but the hand, or we can say with reference to the red-hot piece of iron that iron burns a thing or gives light, yet these are the powers of fire temporarily possessed by iron and not of the iron itself. In the same manner a clear insight into the nature of the bodies and forces working in the universe, will show that from the point of view of their powers and properties, they are the names and attributes of the Divine Being, and it is His power which works in them hiddenly. In the beginning these were all His words and it was His power that manifested them in different forms. The fool will say that if the Word of God took a body, God must have been reduced in size. Does he not see that the burning-glass* diminishes naught from

* The Aryas believe that God is not the creator of anything whether in heaven or upon earth. The material existed from all eternity and God only manufactured that material and fashioned it into different forms. We are indeed sorry for them, for if they have not known the power of God, they are quite destitute of the true and perfect knowledge of God and of His love. No heart can feel the true love of God unless it feels His beauty and goodness, and no one can be freed from sin unless he loves God and fears His displeasure. The love of God consumes sin as fire consumes the dross of the piece of gold which is thrown into it. But the person who neither believes in the beauty of God, *i.e.*, does not consider Him as All-powerful, nor admits His goodness, *i.e.*, does not consider the soul which speaks within him to be from God, cannot love God. The mighty God who created the great heavenly bodies whose number is not known to any

the sun, and the influence of the moon in the nourishment of fruits takes away nothing from that luminary ? This is the secret of God's knowledge and the central point of the spiritual system that the universe has been created from the Word of God.

Upon these considerations based on the Holy Quran, we think it

man, could not stand in need of matter for making them. When I look at the host of heaven and reflect upon their grandeur and wonders and see that this grand universe came into existence at the mere will and command of God, my soul bursts out into the songs of the praise of God, and exclaims : "O mighty God, Thy powers are great, Thy works are wondrous and beyond the comprehension of human reason. The ignorant man denies Thy powers and the fool asks from what material Thou hast made these things."

The Aryas should consider that if God like human beings stands in need of material to make things, He must also require sufficient time for their making. As we estimate that a mason will build a particular wall in a certain number of days before which he will not be able to complete it, we shall also have to believe that the making of the sun or the moon occupied God for so many years. But to fix a time during which God made a particular thing, is the veriest blasphemy. It is bringing down God to the level of mortals and to subject Him to the rules and laws to which human beings are subject. I cannot believe that this detestable doctrine is taught by the Vedas. It seems to be the outcome of Pandit Daya Nand's ingenious brain. The Pandit seems to have formed an idea of God judging from his own needs. As he himself could not live without eating, or satisfy his thirst without drinking, or read the Vedas without hard work and the continuing of his study for many years, he thought that God also could not have formed the universe without pre-existing material. But the person to whom eyes have been granted, cannot like to be blind, and he to whom true knowledge has been vouchsafed, hates ignorance. I have witnessed so many supernatural signs of the powers of God that if I do not bear witness before the whole world that our God has the power to create out of nothing, I shall be a sinner. More than fourteen years ago I saw in a vision that I wrote some matters of importance on a paper, intending them to be fulfilled in that manner and then presented the paper to Almighty God for signature and confirmation. Upon this my God signed the paper with red ink which seemed to me like blood, and before signing spilled the ink from His pen in such a manner that the drops of blood fell upon me. At this I awoke in an ecstacy of pleasure at the idea that Almighty God had accepted whatever I had done and signed the writing without even reading it. At that time a friend of mine, M. Abdulla of Sinaur (Patiala) was sitting by me and he saw the drops of blood that fell upon me and himself. At this strange scene he exclaimed and told me that drops of blood had fallen upon me and himself. Now can any Arya explain how the drops which I saw in vision took a shape externally and from what matter they were created. His only reply would be that the story is a fabrication. At the time that this event happened, I was writing the *Surma-i-Chashm-i-Arya*, and as the sign was manifested in opposition to the Aryas, I think that it was an indication of the murder of Lekh Ram. It also alluded to the appearance of the plague. Such signs manifesting the wonderful and mighty powers of God I have seen in thousands. He who has not seen these powers of God, has seen nothing of God.

possible that the object of the Vedas in celebrating the praise of and addressing hymns and prayers to fire, wind or the sun may have been only to indicate the very close connection with which Divine power is working in them, and to show that on account of this connection they are but a crust while the Divine power working in them is the kernel, and that, therefore, all attributes return to Him only. Hence He is called the fire, and the water and the wind, for the actions of fire, water and wind are not their own but those of God, and their powers are not their own but the powers of God. It is to this that the verse الحمد لله رب العلمين points, the meaning being that whatever is being done by the various powers and forces of the universe for the maintenance of the great system is not their own work but that of the power of God which works in them all. Elsewhere the Holy Quran has compared the world to a floor made of pure crystal under which water is flowing while the fool takes the glasses for the water. Again the Holy Quran says وحملنا هم في البر والبحر "By land and by sea *we* carry them," *i.e.*, though they are apparently carried by other things, yet in reality it is God that carries them.

The conclusion to which we come from all these considerations is that we are prepared to accept this interpretation as regards the Vedic hymns provided the following two points are proved. Firstly, it should be proved that the Vedas like the Holy Quran regard all the heavenly bodies, all the forces of nature and matter and soul as having been created by the hand of God, for unless this is admitted, the properties and powers of these things cannot be regarded as the attributes and powers of God. But the Arya Samaj looks upon matter and soul as eternal and uncreated, and, therefore, their properties and powers must also be considered as eternal and uncreated and as not owing their existence to God. If this is the principle of the Vedas then the conclusion cannot be avoided that by celebrating the praise of fire, the Vedas have taught fire-worship, and by adoring and glorifying the sun they have taught the worship of the sun. But if these things are looked upon as the creation of God's hands and their powers as His powers, the objection cannot stand. Secondly, it is necessary to produce a considerable number of hymns from the Vedas, say fifty or sixty at least, forbidding in plain words the worship of these things and the addressing of prayers to them. If these two points are

proved, the Vedas shall be declared as free from the charge of teaching nature-worship, and if not, the charge is proved.

The faith preached by the Arya Samaj is open to another serious objection. They hold that though the world has neither beginning nor end, yet from all eternity God has so ordained that, at the commencement of each cycle, He reveals His will only in the Sanskrit language within the boundaries of the Indian Peninsula. Three considerations show the absolute falsity of this assertion. In the first place, it is negatived by the quality of universal mercy and benificence in God. It does not appear to be reasonable that God, being the Creator and Lord of all the people living on the face of the earth, should limit the revelation of His will and word for millions of years to one particular country and express it always in one particular language, when the people of one country are unable to understand the language of another. This difficulty was the greater in earlier ages when even the existence of one people was not known to another, and even if known, there were impassable barriers which rendered communication almost impossible. The earlier nations knew each other so little that the people of India were under the impression that there was no population beyond the Himalayas. How reasonable and just is the doctrine taught against this in the Holy Quran. It says: وان من امة الا خلا فيها نذير "There is no people among whom a warner has not been sent;" and again يتلو صحفا مطهرة فيها كتب قيمة *i.e.*, the Holy Quran contains all the true and sacred scriptures that were revealed before it. These verses show that in the earlier ages Almighty God gave a separate revelation to every nation which had settled in a different country because the circumstances then necessitated such a course, but that now He wills to make them all one as He is one. To gather all into one fold, He sent the Holy Quran and revealed therein that a time shall come when He shall make all people one nation, and all countries one land and all languages one language. Now we see that the world is making an approach to this state and the relations between different countries are fast strengthening. The means of travelling have been extremely facilitated, and the interchange of ideas between far and distant lands has become very easy. The union of different nations has been rendered possible by free and easy intercourse. The construction of railways is deemed to render it possible for a person to travel round the world in forty days.

The communication of messages has been rendered easy to a degree which passes belief. From this it appears that it is the will of God to make all people one nation as they were one in the beginning, so that the circle of creation may be complete, and there may be one God, one Prophet and one faith. The principle commends itself to every reasonable being that when different nations lived in different countries and had no means of easy communication and easy intercourse, Almighty God sent His prophets among all the people and did not keep back His favors and grace from any people, but when their union was rendered possible, He comprised all truths and all the rules of guidance in one heavenly book and revealed it in a language which is the mother of languages, *i.e.*, in Arabic. But the Arya Samajic doctrine is repugnant to reason and conscience because it withholds true guidance from every country except India and from every nation except the Hindus. If the doctrine of transmigration has any reality beneath it, the Arya Samaj will do well to explain on its basis why God loved the Hindus so well while rejecting every other people as undeserving of His kindness. Does not God know that other people stand in need of His word being revealed to them in their own language? If He does, why has He eternally kept back this gift from them? What does this favor to the Hindus mean?

In the next place, even if it be supposed for the sake of argument that Almighty God has chosen one country and one language for the revelation of His word from all eternity and that others are not entitled to this favor, His choice ought to have fallen upon a language which should have been the first and the last of all languages, which, in other words, should have been them other of all languages and upon which death could never have come. But the language of the Vedas enjoys neither of these distinctions, for it cannot claim to be the mother of languages and it is long since dead. Both these distinctions belong to Arabic which is the mother of languages and which of all those languages in which heavenly books have been revealed, is the only living language. If God had to choose only one language for revealing His Word to mankind, He ought to have chosen Arabic and addressed all the nations in that language. I am writing a book in which it shall be proved on the basis of strong and irrefutable arguments drawn from a comparison

of words and the vast treasures of scientific facts disclosed in Arabic, that Arabic is the mother of all languages.

The third argument falsifying the Arya Samajic doctrine that the Vedic revelation has closed the door to further revelation, is my personal experience. I see that Almighty God speaks to me every day and reveals the secrets of the future and instructs me in His knowledge. If the Vedas do really assert that the door to revelation has been closed with them, we need no other argument for their falsification. The glorious revelation which God has vouchsafed to me far transcends the Vedâs. It is the boundless ocean of extraordinary signs and of secrets of the future. It comes to me generally in Arabic which is the majestic seat of the word of prophecy, but sometimes also in other languages such as Urdu and Persian, and even in the unknown accents of the English language. If the Aryas ask me as to the signs which show that it is the Word of God, I say that the prophecy revealing the death of Lekh Ram and the day and date and manner of his death is a sufficient testimony. And this is by no means the only prophecy; more than a hundred thousand signs of this nature have been manifested by God through me and witnessed by hundreds of thousands of human beings among whom are many respectable Aryas. There is not a single prophecy which has not been fulfilled wholly or of which one part has not been fulfilled, the other awaiting fulfilment. The man who rejects these mighty signs of God, fights with Him.

The Teachings of Christianity, Arya Samaj and Islam in relation to the Social and Moral conduct of man.

It is hardly necessary to deal at any length with the Christian social and moral teachings. Briefly they may be summarised in two rather unpleasant but comprehensive words, *viz.*, blood-bath and drunkenness. The doctrine of the remission of sins through the blood of Jesus Christ has removed the burden from the Christian

shoulders, the burden not of sin but of striving after virtue and austere religious devotion. Nay, it has emboldened in vice most of those who trust in it. Once the doctrine is admitted that the blood of Christ procures an actual forgiveness of sins, the evil consequences that must flow from it need not be stated. As a matter of fact it has struck at the very root of the purity of heart among the general body of its indorsers. Combined with drunkenness it has been the most dangerous weapon in robbing the world of virtue. In support of it, it is often asserted that Jesus also drank wine, and, therefore, it is the duty of every true Christian to follow the example set by his master. The destruction and havoc which these two incentives to vice have wrought is fearful. Their combination has produced a combustible with a terrible effect in consuming piety and purity of heart. It is more terrible than gun-powder, for the effect of its evil is not limited to a few miles but extends to thousands of miles.

The free intermingling of men and women in European Society has rendered the evil wrought by drink still more terrible. The pure in heart and God-fearers are comparatively few while the generality of mankind are, like brutes, slaves to their passions. They are unable to resist the temptations of the flesh and the devil and have not the power to overcome lust, and therefore readily fall a victim to vice and corruption. Intoxicating liquors further weaken the power of control and excite the lusts and passions. The fear of God vanishes away from the heart, and youthful passions, lust and wine make a man quite blind. In this state of the excitement of lust and passions, the free intermingling of young men and women leads to disgraceful acts of debauchery and immorality, to the danger of which even Europe is now becoming awake. As the Christian countries have been obliged to pass the laws of divorce, they shall also have to stop the free intermixing of the two sexes though perhaps after many sad experiences. For if no stop is put to this evil, there is no doubt that the generality of society will be like brutes some day. How can such people be pure in heart? The pure in heart are those who deem themselves every moment in the awful presence of God. It is not only the physical death which they fear, but their desires and passions are every moment under-

going a death before the awful majesty of God. But how can the wine-drinker reach this stage? Drinking and fear of God can never abide together. It is difficult to say which of the two has wrought the greater evil, the doctrine of atonement or the use of wine. If there is any benefit in the use of intoxicating liquors, it is this that the advantages of atonement can be brought into fuller display. We are surprised to see the Christians using wine like water when we find ourselves averse to its use even as a remedy for disease.

It will not be out of place to relate here a brief personal anecdote. I have been suffering from diabetes for a long time and sometimes it becomes very troublesome. A friend of mine once advised me to make use of opium as a medicine. I thanked him for his sympathy but expressed my regret that I could not make use of such a drug as I feared lest it should be turned into a joke that the first Messiah was a wine-bibber and the second is an opium-eater. I trusted in my God and He has saved me from all these impurities. Often when the attack becomes severe, Almighty God says to me: "Lo, I have healed thee," and the disease vanishes away. Such experiences have convinced me that my God is powerful over everything. They tell a lie who say that He has created neither soul nor matter. They are in ignorance and error. We see His new creation every day. He breathes into us a new soul with our advancement in spirituality. Had He not the power to create from nothing, life would have been a death to us. Wonderful is the God who is our God; who is there like unto Him? Wonderful are His works; who is there whose works are like unto His works? He is the all-powerful and Almighty God, and what He does not do, He does not do because of His great wisdom. I have been suffering from two diseases for over twenty years, vertigo and diabetes, which disappear temporarily upon prayer. On one occasion I prayed to God that they may disappear permanently, but the answer was that this shall not be. Then I knew that the continuance of these two diseases is in fact a sign of the Promised Messiah, for it is written that he shall descend with two yellow mantles on. The interpretation of this prophecy (for prophecy like vision sometimes requires to be interpreted) is plainly this that he shall be suffering from two diseases, because a yellow mantle in a vision represents

a disease as given in all authoritative books of interpretation.

It should not be imagined that we have overlooked the Gospel teaching in this discussion. The avowed object of the advent of Jesus was simply to save the world by his blood. The Gospel teaching contains nothing new; it is taken all from the Jews. In the second place its principles are utterly impracticable. There is not a single man who acts upon it, and if any one does, he shall be regarded as a crank or a lunatic even by the Christians. Do the Courts of Justice act upon the Gospel-teaching? Does the Christian public act upon it? Do the clergy and the missionaries act upon it? Experience answers all these questions in the negative. One thing only is certain and that is that both Europe and America are taking full advantage of atonement.

Moreover, it is an error to regard the Gospel-teaching as making any approach to perfection. It does not assist in the growth of all the branches of the human tree, but aims at the development of one branch at the expense of others. It does not develop all the qualities whose development is necessary for the perfection of man. Man comes into the world with different qualities that he may use each of them as the occasion arises. He is the possessor of the meekness of the sheep and of the bravery of the lion, so that he may act the sheep or act the lion according to the propriety of the occasion. God does not wish him to display always one quality utterly suppressing the other. As he satisfies each one of his physical requirements on the proper occasion, so must he satisfy his moral requirements also. He should not lay the whole stress upon one quality utterly neglecting all the others. As Almighty God has given to his nature the quality of meekness, forbearance and patience, so he has given him anger and vengeance. It is absolutely erroneous to give emphasis to the development of one quality and ignore the other, for this is finding faults with God who gave man the qualities whose use is only injurious. The truth is that the qualities given to man are not in themselves injurious but it is their abuse which makes them so. Moreover, the Christians boast of the high morality of Gospel-teachings, but practically they refuse to act upon them. Any one can demonstrate this for himself by smiting a clergyman or a missionary on the cheek. Instead of

finding the other cheek turned to him to smite again, he will find himself in a court of law. Are not these so many words wasted if they are never meant for being acted upon ?

In fine contrast with this defective teaching of the Gospel which tells a man never to resist evil, look at the wise precepts of the Holy Quran. It says : جزاء سيئة سيئة مثلها فمن عفا واصلح فاجره على الله "The punishment for evil is evil proportionate thereto but if you forgive when your forgiveness is conducive to good, as for instance you think that the aggressor will mend his conduct in future if he is forgiven, in such a case forgiveness is better than punishment, and for this goodness God shall give you a good reward." This verse suggests a course of conduct in which equal regard is paid to both sides of human nature, and the condition of the propriety of the occasion has been imposed both upon punishment and forgiveness. This is the only wise course for action and upon this hangs the system of the world. It is the occasion, which determines the proper course of social and moral conduct as it determines the physical course of life. Any teaching which recommends a particular course, say forgiveness or punishment, in all cases without considering the circumstances of the case, proceeds on entirely false principles.

The Aryan teaching in relation to the social and moral conduct of a man brings us face to face with the grossly immoral doctrine of the *Niyoga*, which, if it were not for its plain avowal by the Arya Samaj, could not be mentioned in a decent writing. Pandit Daya Nand has been the first man to avow it and declare it openly as the most excellent teaching of the Vedas. Had he limited the application of this doctrine to the widows only, it could have, perhaps, passed unnoticed. But Daya Nand presents it to us in a form highly repugnant to human nature. In the *Satiarath Parkash* the Pandit states on the authority of the Vedas—we do not think the Vedas teach such a repulsive doctrine—that if there is a woman who is living in actual matrimony and has a living and healthy husband who cannot raise male children to her, *i.e.*, either only daughters are born or there exists some other reason on account of which some time passes without the birth of a child, it is the

duty of the husband to invite a third person to his house to have sexual connection with his wife, and this shameful course may be continued until eleven* male children are born to the woman from the stranger's seed. Such is the doctrine of *Niyoga* as stated by the founder of the Arya Samaj.

Comment upon this disgraceful doctrine is needless. It strikes at the root of the purity which a man aims at. Human nature recoils from it. That a woman in the lawful wedlock of a man should lie with a stranger, and that her husband should not only give his consent to this disgraceful act of hers but must also be pleased that a religious duty devolving upon him has been discharged, is more than we can conceive. Does the jealousy which God has planted in human nature bear this? Consider the jealousy which Ram Chandra showed when his wife Sita was kidnapped by Ravana. Ravana was a Brahman by caste and Sita had no children up to that time, and there was no hinderance to the performance of the ceremony of *Niyoga*. Had Rama been an indorser to this doctrine, he could not have shown such jealousy for his chaste wife, and murdered Ravna and laid waste his country for Sita's abduction. The fact is that the man who is not jealous for the chastity of his wife, does not deserve to be called a man. Even birds show jealousy for their mates. Have not human beings even the shame and jealousy which is met with in birds?

Pandit Daya Nand traces this doctrine in the Vedas but we cannot ascribe such disgraceful doctrines to the Vedas. It is more probable that he may have founded it on a misapprehension of the Vedic words, for we do not think that his learning was so great as to enable him never to err in translating the words of a language which was not his mother-tongue. We know perfectly well that some words are capable of bearing a hundred different significations, and a man who is not guided by true light, can hardly be

* I am not certain whether the number of male children which a married woman is allowed to bear from the seed of others than her husband is exactly eleven or slightly differing from it. If there is a mistake, I shall be thankful to any member of the Arya Samaj for its correction.

expected to hit upon the right meaning in such cases. Any one who has not the spirit of true jealousy and modesty in him, is apt to err on such an occasion on the side of immodesty and indelicacy. It may be asked why did Pandit Daya Nand lay so much stress on this dishonorable doctrine and embody it in his book in plain words? The reason of it is not, in my opinion, far to seek. The Pandit led his whole life in celebacy and never entered into matrimonial relations. Consequently he was an utter stranger to the feeling of jealousy which a man has for his wife. He did not know that a husband's jealousy for his wife is an honorable and noble passion, and that it is felt not only by the higher and civilised classes of society but by all classes of men. It is a feeling innate in the nature of man and men have jealousy not only for their wives but also for their mistresses, notwithstanding that the connection in the latter case is illegal. Had Daya Nand been a married man, he would never have taught a doctrine which strikes at the root of the noble feeling of jealousy and makes men worse than cuckolds. We do not think any noble Arya would yield to this disgrace. The doctrine is calculated to spread looseness of character in the world, and even the Government may have to interfere some day to stop this immorality as it did in the case of *Suttee*.

The doctrine of the transmigration of souls is another false doctrine taught by the Arya Samaj. It is founded upon an erroneous principle. The *Satiarath Parkash* tells us that the soul while flitting in the atmosphere descends with dew on plants and vegetables and is taken in by a female who happens to eat the fruit or the vegetable. If this is the process by which a soul enters into a new body, the soul must fall on plants and vegetables in two parts, of which one part must be taken by a male being and the other by a female, for it cannot be doubted that the child inherits the characteristics of both parents. This doctrine requires the division of the soul into two parts which is apparently a false principle. Secondly, our experience of the world falsifies this doctrine, because we see life coming in a thousand different ways in which the descending of the soul with dew and its being eaten by a femal is impossible. Thirdly, the doctrine deals a death-blow to purity, for a

man may marry a woman who in a previous birth was his own mother or daughter or sister or grand mother and thus be guilty of the heinous crime of incest. Had the doctrine been true, there ought to have been some indication with every new-born child that it stood in such and such a close relationship to such and such a person in a previous life. Fourthly, the doctrine of transmigration divests God of His power, for it requires that the souls should be eternal and not created by Him, and the falsity of this has already been pointed out. It is moreover clear that animal-creation follows certain systematic Divine laws, whereas the commission of sins by human beings does not follow any such system. For instance, in the rainy season countless insects come into existence, yet no one having the slightest share of common sense ever thinks that their creation is due to the multiplicity of sin in human beings. In fact, the absurdity of this doctrine becomes apparent to every thinking mind in a thousand different ways if he gives any consideration to it. The doctrine has been introduced to explain the difference of grades in men but it is never considered that the same difference of grades exists even in the case of inorganic beings.

Failing to find any argument in favor of *Niyoga*, the Aryas compare it to *Muta'*. Now, in the first place the Holy Quran gives us no directions for *Muta'*. It speaks only of *Nikah* or marriage. *Muta* was recognised in pre-Islamic Arabia but it was abolished by the Holy Quran. The doctrine is moreover rejected by a very large majority of the Muslims. Only some sects of the Shias consider it permissible. They enter into a temporary marriage-contract in which it is agreed upon that after the lapse of a certain time fixed before marriage, the contract of marriage shall come to an end and the parties will no more be in the relation of husband and wife to each other. This is called *Muta'* and is practised by some Shias independently of the authority of the Holy Quran while rejected by all other Muslims. Secondly, even *Muta'* bears no similarity to *Niyoga*. *Muta'* is after all a marriage in which divorce takes place after a fixed time known to both parties. So long as the contract of marriage is in force, the parties stand to each other

in the legal relation of husband and wife, but the relation is cut off when the contract ceases to be in force. *Muta'* is, therefore, a peculiar case of marriage and divorce, and there is not the least resemblance in it to *Niyoga*, in which the wife who has a living husband is required to have a carnal knowledge of a third person under the hope that from his seed a male child will be born to her. As regards divorce, its necessity has been admitted in all civilised countries, and the Christian nations have been obliged after long experience to enact laws according to which marriage is dissolved on various grounds such as aversion, quarrelsomeness, drunkenness, extravagance, hatred, ill-will, prodigality and various other reasons. The permission of polygamy in Islam has no similarity with the *Niyoga*, for even among the Hindus polygamy has been practised by great men and Rajas.

But if the Aryas think that there is no difference between the two cases, *i.e.*, when a living husband calls a stranger to cohabit with his wife, and when a husband divorces his wife on account of her loose conduct or on some other good and reasonable ground, the matter can be easily decided. In India there are many respectable men, whether following Islam or any other religion, who have been obliged to divorce their wives for good grounds and to treat them like a mortified limb which it is better to cut off. We can give a list of gentlemen who cut off all connections with their wives when they found that they could not live with them in peace and chastity. We hope that the Arya Samajists will also not hesitate to publish* a list of the respectable Aryas who have subjected their wives to the practice of *Niyoga* in their life-times and to state against each name the number and names of the children obtained by this process. If the doctrine of *Niyoga* is really a noble doctrine taught by the holy Vedas, as the Arya Samajists state it to be, we believe that every good Arya must have deemed it a pride to act according to it.

* Sometime ago an Arya, probably from Ferozepur, published an advertisement in a newspaper that any person desirous of having his wife subjected to *Niyoga*, should apply to him as he was a fit person to be the *Birajdata*. We do not know whether any Arya Samajist of Qadian replied to this advertisement.

In respect of chastity the Holy Quran teaches a doctrine totally different from that taught by the Arya Samaj. Thus it says: قل للمومنين يغضوا من ابصارهم و يحفظوا فروجهم ذالک ازکی لهم۔ قل للمومنت يغضضن من ابصارهن و يحفظن فروجهن "Say to the believing men and women that they should restrain their eyes from looking upon strange women or men and restrain their ears from the hearing of sweet or lustful voices and observe continence, so that they may be purified." That this teaching which forbids men to look upon strange women and forbids women to look on strange men is superior to the doctrine of *Niyoga* which requires a husband to invite a stranger to cohabit with his wife, is apparent to every one not blinded by prejudice. The pity is that when these people are told that this is an immoral practice and must be discontinued, they answer the sympathetic advice by objecting to divorce which is allowed in Islam. But the need of divorce has been felt by the whole world and it is folly to object to it. Moreover the divorced woman has no connection with the man who divorces her and she is as dead to him. Had the Arya Samaj taught the dissolution of the marriage-contract in cases of need, in cases of adultry, violent discord or disobedience, no man with sense in his head would have objected to it. The union of a man and a woman as husband and wife is intended for the purity and chastity of the two, for they stand to each other in the relation of sincere and faithful friends, and assist each other in virtue and goodness ; but if the connection of purity cannot be maintained, it is better that the two should be separated, for their union has failed to fulfil the noble object of marriage. In fact, Islam has felt the need of divorce on account of the transcendent purity which it teaches. A religion which teaches men to live as contented cuckolds need not teach divorce.

Which of the three religions, Christianity, Arya Samaj and Islam, guides men to the Living God.

The true object of following the principles of any religion is to

see God, the true fountain of salvation, with the perfect certainty with which a visible thing is seen. The tendency of sin is to bring destruction upon a man's head, and there is no panacea against this poison except a certain belief in the living and perfect God, and a certain knowledge that Almighty God punishes the evil-doer with sore punishment and rewards His righteous servant with true happiness. It is our every-day experience that the object which is certainly known to be destructive is never approached. No one takes a strong dose of poison or stands before a ferocious lion or thrusts his hand into the hole of a poisonous serpent, but there are many men who sin intentionally. The reason of it is plain, *viz.*, that sin is not dreaded like poison. It is the primary duty of a seeker after truth to have a certain belief in God and to choose the religion which can lead to such certainty, so that having attained it, he may fear God and be saved from sin. But how can such certainty of the existence of God be attained? Not by the idle tales of the marvels done in the past. Not even by following the authority of reason because it is indecisive. There is only one path to reach this certainty, *viz.*, that a man should witness the supernatural signs of the existence of God through His word spoken to him, and by its often repetition obtain a certainty in His might and power; or at least he should have a close connection with and sit in the company of a person who is spoken to by God. The prophecies of a prophet who is dead give satisfaction for some time after his death, but when a long time has elapsed, they become mere tales and cease to have any effect on the purity of life.

The Aryas and the Christians are both devoid of this high degree of certainty. They have tales in their hands but they cannot witness the living manifestations of the glory of the Living God. But our living God who brings every thing into life and supports it, speaks to us as one man speaks to another. When we pray and address our supplications to Him, He answers in glorious and powerful words, and if it happen a thousand times, He still answers in the same sweet voice. In His word He reveals deep and wonderful secrets of the future and manifests wondrous scenes of His supernatural power until He brings a conviction to the mind that He is the true God. He listens to our prayers and informs us of

their acceptance beforehand. He removes all our difficulties and on our prayers gives life even to those who are like the dead. The true God is the God who is our God. With His words which disclose the future He proves to us that He is the God who is the Lord of earth and heavens. He spoke to me and said : "I shall save thee from the plague, and I shall save all those who live in thy house in purity and righteousness." Is there any one else who has published such a revelation and claimed the sure protection of God for himself, his wife, his children and other good and righteous men living in his house ? More than a hundred thousand signs have appeared and to some of these Lalas Sharmpat and Malawa Mal who belong to the Arya Samaj, are eye-witnesses. But they are not the only witnesses; their leading Pandit* has by his death made the whole Arya community a witness to my heavenly signs.

It should be borne in mind that another great prophecy regarding the plague has been fulfilled. Several years ago I published in a book that the plague shall bring many people to me. In accordance with this prophecy more than ten thousand people have already come to me from the fear of the plague. Almighty God compared this dispensation to Noah's Ark. Even animals and beasts had taken refuge in the Ark prepared by Noah. It is not true that Noah had caught all these animals from the forest and put them in cages in his ark, but terror-stricken they themselves sought refuge in the ark, as there was no other shelter left. Similarly people are coming to seek shelter in my ark, when every other refuge has failed to afford them shelter.

Hearken to me all ye that live upon earth, the Aryas and the Christians have nothing in their hands but idle tales. This is the

* I see that the Aryas are exceeding all limits in their abuses and calumniations. Besides the Vedic gods, they have fashioned a new god for themselves and this is their community. The time has come when the living God shall show mighty signs in support of the truth. The weakness of the Vedic God was made manifest to them on the memorable 6th of March (1897), but the new god which they have now chosen for their worship has made them forget that event. They ought now to state plainly what kind of miracle they want from me. Almighty God will then answer their challenge as He likes. To laugh at God and His word is not good. As they say, the Vedas may not be the word of God, but they should see and test the Word of God which is revealed to me and not hold it in derision without seeing.

reason that the latter have taken a man for God who was in no way superior to the writer. Had he seen me, he would have found the blessings of God showered more abundantly upon me than upon himself. This is the false deity of the Christians. The Aryas have also made for themselves a God after man. They regard him as weak as a mortal and unable to create soul and matter. Had they seen the fresh manifestations of the power of God, they would have known that God has power over everything and that the weakness of mortals cannot be ascribed to Him. What is soul that He should not have the power to create it? What are the particles of matter that He should not have the might to bring them into existence? There is a soul within the soul and there are particles within the particles of matter, and God is the Creator of all. He creates of His own accord as well as upon the prayers of His chosen servants. He is blind who has not seen Him and known Him thus. As He Himself says: من كان في هذه اعمى فهو في الاخرة اعمى "He who has not seen Him in this world shall not see Him hereafter, but shall remain blind in both worlds." It is here that a man gets eyes to see God, and it is here that a heavenly life begins.

In the announcements issued by the Arya Samaj, it has been asserted that some of my prophecies have not been fulfilled. For instance, it is said that I prophesied the birth of a son to me and that the prophecy was not fulfilled, as instead of a son a daughter was born. This is a disgraceful lie. I never prophesied that the first child born after the publication of the prophecy would be a son. I prophesied the birth of four sons at different times and they are all born. Now I have prophesied the birth of a fifth son and God will fulfil the prophecy in its time. In all the revealed books the prophecy of a general destruction of the world is found and the Hindus also believe in a *Mahaparlu* (great destruction), yet the earth is being more and more stocked with inhabitants. Does it follow then that this prophecy contained in the Word of God has turned out to be false? There is an hour fixed for the fulfilment of every prophecy and when that hour comes, the Word of God is fulfilled.

The Aryas have also objected to the prophecy concerning Atham. The objection would have carried weight had I died before Atham, because

the purport of the revelation was only this that the liar would die in the life-time of the other. There was also the plain condition that if Atham repented of his calumniations agianst Islam, he would be granted a respite. This condition he fulfilled in the same meeting where the prophecy was announced in the presence of about seventy men, of whom half were Christians. Moreover, he passed the rest of his days in fear and weeping, and thus bore witness to the fact that he felt the awe of the prophecy. Therefore, since he availed himself of the condition contained in the prophecy, he was granted a short respite as foretold by God, and was at last launched into the grave to fulfil the truth of the Divine words. But the wonder is that the Aryas do not mention the prophecy about their own leader. Why has the Samaj forgotten the fulfilment of a prophecy nearer home? Lekh Ram's death is a plain sign and the Samaj ought not to shut its eyes in the matter. He published a prophecy foretelling my death from cholera within three years. God, he said, had informed him of this. My God also informed me that Lekh Ram would be murdered within six years, and the day of his murder would be next to 'Id and that a plague would then visit this county. All these facts I published upon revelation from God, and all were fulfilled to the letter. The famous Arya preacher met his fate in accordance with the prophecy and left a legacy of disgrace for the Samaj. The memorable sixth of March shall for ever bear witness to the truth of the God of Islam. If it was my conjecture, how did it happen that the prophecy of my death published by Lekh Ram turned out to be false and added only to the disgrace of the Samaj? If the prophecy published by Lekh Ram was from God, why did the Aryan God fail to fulfil his words, and if it was not, is it honorable to erect memorials to a man who was a liar and impostor? Is it not sufficient to show which party has the living and the true God on its side?

Answer to objections of the Arya Samaj against Islam.

The following is a brief discussion of the objections advanced against Islam by the Samaj leaders at an Annual Meeting of the Arya Samaj, held at Qadian on the 28th of February 1903.

I.—*A'RSH.*

The first objection of the Arya Samaj is against *a'rsh*. It has been said that the Muslim belief insults God by making him sit upon *a'rsh* (throne) which is borne by four angels on their shoulders. The evils of this belief are, it is stated, that God must be looked upon as a finite being, who is not self-supporting, omnipresent or omniscient.

This objection is an audacious misrepresentation of the Muslim belief. The Muslims do not regard *a'rsh* as a material object created by God to sit upon. Not a single verse in the Holy Quran lends the least support to the assertion that *a'rsh* is a material thing created by God. The Quran has repeatedly asserted that Almighty God is the creator of everything which exists, of the earth and heavens, and of the souls and their attributes, that He is self-existing and self-supporting, the creator of all existence and the supporter of all creation. But nowhere does it say that the *a'rsh* is a material object created by God. The objection is, therefore, absolutely groundless, for *a'rsh* is not a material object which God uses as His throne. In the Holy Quran Almighty God says that He is on earth and upon heaven, yet He is not supported by anything. On the other hand, He is self-supporting and the supporter of everything. He is all-comprehensive, the fourth of every three and the sixth of every five, there being no place where He is not present. Again he says: اینما تولوا فثم وجه اللہ "Whichever way you turn your face, you shall find the face of God." "He is closer to man than his neck-vein." "He is the first and He is the last and He is the most manifest of all, and He is the most hidden of all." And again He says: واذا سألک عبادی عنی فانی قریب اجیب دعوۃ الداع اذا دعان "And when my servants ask thee concerning me, say to them that I am nearer to them than everything else; I answer the cry of him who cries to me with a true belief in me." "Everything is in my hands and my knowledge comprehends all." "It is I who support earth and heaven" and "It is I who carry you on land and water."

These are all the verses of the Holy Quran and there is not a single Muslim on the face of the earth who thinks that God is finite and that His knowledge is limited. Nowhere is it said in the Holy Quran that any angel or anything else supports God. What is it but downright

dishonesty to ignore all these plain verses and to advance an objection by misconstruing metaphorical language. A fair-minded and honest critic could have no difficulty in seeing that when the *a'rsh* is not a material and created thing according to the Quran, the bearing of the *a'rsh* by the angels must be a metaphor. But the jaundiced eye of prejudice cannot see things as they are.

We shall now explain what is meant by *a'rsh*, and by its being borne by four angels. The *a'rsh* whenever used in the Holy Quran, signifies the Divine majesty, grandeur and greatness. This is the reason that the *a'rsh* is not included in created things. Now there are four manifestations of the majesty and grandeur of God which are addressed as four gods (akash or Indra, the sun, the moon and the earth) in the Vedas. The complete manifestations of the Divine majesty and glory are the four attributes mentioned in the *Sura Fatiha* as the chief requisites of Divinity, and it is after relating these four attributes that Almighty God directs men to say that they worship Him alone and seek assistance from Him alone as it is His person that combines in it the four attributes regulating the system of the universe. The four attributes in fact encircle the whole wide range of Divinity and comprise all the attributes of God whose manifestation is needed to uphold the system of this world from its creation to the day of judgment. These four attributes, therefore, reveal a perfect image of the Divine Being. This is the reason that where the creation of earth and heaven is described, there it is stated ثم استوى على العرش "Then God sat upon the *a'rsh*," *i. e.*, with the creation of the world His four attributes which reveal the perfect image of His Divinity were brought into manifestation in the system of this world. This complete manifestation of all His attributes is described in the Holy Quran as استوى على العرش *i.e.*, sitting with calmness and dignity on *a'rsh*, for as already stated *a'rsh* signifies the majesty and grandeur of God of which the four attributes described in the beginning of the *Sura Fatiha* are manifestations. The metaphor is taken from the sitting of a king on his throne with a full display of royal dignity when everything necessary for the parade of royalty is supplied without delay, gifts and donations are freely given, faithful servants are encouraged with assistance in the performance of their duties and justice is dealt out to all. These are the four requirements of monarchy, and when a king

sits on the throne, these four requirements are fully satisfied. Therefore when the four great attributes of the Divine Being, of which the four requirements of monarchy are shadows, are completely manifested, the Divine Being is described as sitting upon *a'rsh*.

It remains to be explained what is meant by four angels bearing the *a'rsh* of God. The four attributes which are representative of God's *a'rsh* or majesty, are manifested in the world through four angels who have charge over four physical instruments through which Divine sustenance is granted to mankind. The angels are thus intermediaries between the Divine attributes and their physical manifestations. It is the physical manifestations of the Divine Being which have been deified in the Vedas, and thus the error has been committed of taking the shadow for the substance. These manifestations are, as it were, the bearers of the four attributes of God of which they are the respective manifestations. The statement, therefore, that the *a'rsh* of God is borne by four angels falsifies the belief of the worshippers of nature who take the four manifestations of the attributes of God as independent gods, and warns them that they are not masters but only the servants of a great Master and carry out His will in obedience to His orders. They serve as mirrors in reflecting the Divine attributes of majesty and glory, and are, therefore, the bearers of the Divine *a'rsh* which represents the majesty and glory of God. These four attributes of God as already described are *rabubiyyat* (substenance), *rahmaniyyat* (mercy), *rahimiyyat* (compassion), and *malikiyyat* (judgment) which are momently acting in this world. The physical manifestations through which these attributes work were taken by the idol-worshippers for independent gods, and as idol-worship prevailed in the world at the time of the revelation of the Holy Quran, therefore the Holy Book exposed the error of all idol-worshippers in its opening chapter and told them in plain words that all these attributes really belonged to God, and the physical instruments through which they were manifested, were really servants and thus bearing His *a'rsh*. The idol-worshippers of Arabia like those of India, and even those of the time of Noah, had the same four chief idols which in Arabia were called *Lat*, *Manat*, *Uzza*, and *Habal*. These were regarded as independent sustainers and intercessors that could intercede with God for their worshippers.

It would appear from this that the statement of the *a'rsh* being borne by angels is meant to strike at the root of idol-worship and the authority and power of the supposed gods, and to warn people that the physical manifestations of Divine majesty and glory are nothing more than servants implicitly obeying the commandments of the Divine Being. The Muslim belief is, therefore, not in any way objectionable inasmuch as it inculcates the worship of the master. It is the Vedic doctrine which is open to the serious objection of teaching men to bow before servants, nay the servants of servants, instead of the master, for between the physical manifestations of the Divine majesty and glory and the Divine Being, there are other intermediaries which are known as angels (the four chief angels being Gabrael, Israfeel, Azrael, Michael) in Muslim Law, and are recognised by the Sanatan Dharma under the name of Jam. It should also be borne in mind that the Holy Quran describes three kinds of angels, *viz.*, (1), the properties of the souls and the particles of matter; (2), the powers of *akash*, the sun, the moon and the earth, which are engaged in work; and the (3), the supreme powers such as Michael, Gabriel, &c., working over all. The word angel as used in the Holy Quran is not restricted to a particular class of beings. Everything that hears the voice of God is an angel, and, therefore, every atom is an angel for it hears the voice of God and obeys Him. If the atoms do not hear the voice of God, how did He create the universe?

It is clear from this that the Muslim belief does not look upon God as finite. But the god presented by the Arya Samaj is not only finite but also lifeless. He can neither hear the voice of men nor give an answer to them. If God has not created any thing, He cannot be infinite. In this case we shall have to consider three different things existing independently of one another and occupying space. Not being the Creator of soul and matter, God cannot enter into them, for they are eternal and uncreated. In respect of eternity and self-existence matter and soul are on a level with God. And if God is finite, His knowledge must also be limited. The Holy Quran on the other hand describes God as the soul of every soul, the origin and succor of all life, the creator of every atom and its support, and as comprehending all, for everything proceeds from Him.

II.—CREATION.

The second objection of the Arya Samaj is that according to Muslim belief God has been sitting idle from all eternity as the creation of the world took place only a few thousand years ago. This is also a misrepresentation of the Muslim belief, for the Muslims do not hold that before the creation of Adam there were no creatures. God says repeatedly in the Holy Quran that He has been a Creator from eternity, but we do not profess to know, nor can man comprehend, the details as to the earlier creations. We believe on the basis of the Holy Quran that God has never been idle, though we cannot know how many worlds He created and how many He brought to destruction. The Christians believe that the world was created only a few thousand years ago and that before that there was nothing, but we cannot be responsible for others' beliefs. The Muslims, therefore, believe that God has been creating both matter and soul from eternity, though the Aryas do not give Him the credit of having even once created anything.

III.—CHANGE OF LAW.

The third objection is stated to be that the Muslim God is changeable because He changes His commandments. Now, the Holy Quran does not say anywhere that God changes. The change in His commandments is due, we are told, to a change in the conditions of man. Such changes we witness also in the work of God as manifested in nature. The embryo is supplied with one kind of food ; when it is born, it becomes a suckling and is supplied with another ; and at last the weanling is given a third kind. In each new condition, a new kind of nourishment is needed and Almighty God commands the angles in each case that the required food be supplied, and, therefore, the first command is, as it were, abrogated when the second is given. Such changes, we admit, take place in the commandments of God whether those commandments are given through nature or through law.

According to the Vedas, as interpreted by the Arya Samaj, however, God is not the Master of these changes ; for the denial of angels necessarily leads one to conclude that no particle of matter or soul hears the voice of God, and, therefore, the necessary changes in them,

cannot be effected by His commandments. Such a view, except in name, is clearly atheistic, for in this case it shall have to be supposed that God has no knowledge of whatever is going on in the world, nor is it in obedience to His will and commandments. The Holy Quran tells us that whatever is going on in the world, the formation of metals and precious stones underground or in the bed of rivers, and the development of the embryo in the egg or in the womb of a female, is all in obedience to the commandments of God, because every particle of matter hears His voice and is an angel having a particular function which it performs as directed by His will. Similarly there are angles upon the heavens. For instance, the heat of the sun is an angel which ripens the fruits and does other works in obedience to the commandments of God. The denial that all these are not the angels of God, and that, therefore, they are not executing His commandments in obedience to His will, is practically atheism.

IV.—INTERCESSION.

It is objected that to trust in intercession is *shirk*, *i.e.*, setting up gods with God. Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ *i.e.*, no one can intercede with God except with His permission. Intercession according to the Holy Quran consists in a Muslim's praying for his brother that an object may be attained or an evil averted. It is, therefore, one of the commandments of the Holy Quran that the person who is more bent to God should pray for his weaker brethren that they may also have the same relation with God as he has. This is the truth underlying intercession and we always pray God that He may strengthen our brethren and remove their afflictions. In this consists true sympathy with our fellow-beings. But if the Vedas do not contain the teaching that a person should pray for his brethren, it is a serious defect and not an excellence. All men are like one body, and, therefore, Almighty God has taught us that we should always intercede with Him for our brethren and pray for their welfare by way of sympathy as it is a duty devolving upon us. The word *shafa'at* meaning intercession is derived from *shafa'* which means to couple. A person is, therefore, said to be *shafi'* or intercessor for another when he so identifies himself with the other's cause as to lose himself in him and prays for his happiness

with the same zeal as he would have prayed for his own. In fact no one can be said to be perfect in his faith unless his heart melts in this manner with sympathy for others. The two great objects of religion are to create in a man, (1) a true love for God, and (2) a true love for one's fellow-beings which should prompt him to pray for them as if their afflictions were his own afflictions, or in other words an intercession for his brethren.

Sanatan Dharm.

We wish to state it expressly that in the above criticism of the Vedic doctrines and principles we have been chiefly concerned with what Pandit Daya Nand has represented the Vedas to be. We are not inclined to believe that the special doctrines taught by the Arya Samaj are really the teachings of the Vedas. The Sanatan Dharm which represents the orthodox Hindu view of the Vedic teachings, considers the peculiar doctrines of the Arya Samaj as innovations to which the Vedas lend no support. The founder of the Arya Samaj has also been accused of having followed the materialistic views of some ancient Hindus instead of following the Hindu sacred scriptures. But as his views could not find acceptance in the Hindu public, he thought it advisable to support them by the Vedic hymns. Now as a matter of fact the same words may sometimes be interpreted in twenty different ways, and Daya Nanad had no right to reject the established meaning of the Vedas which had been current even in practice and admitted by learned Pandits for over two thousand years. The two doctrines, *i.e.*, the co-eternity of soul and matter with God, and *Niyoga*, which are a disgrace to the Arya Samaj are not owned by the Sanatan Dharm. We note the difference below.

The Arya Samaj has ever been proud that it has taught the worship of one God instead of the idol-worship which prevailed among the Hindus. Idol-worship has no doubt been the religion of the masses of the Hindus, but the *yogis* and other great men among them have been the worshippers of the true God and have rejected idol-worship. Idol-worship has been thought by the Hindus as a form of worship compatible with ignorance and worldliness, but the person who rises above the masses and forsakes the world, renounces idol-worship and seeks

connection with God. As to the Hindu reverence for *avatars, i.e.,* incarnations of the Deity, it is not true that such reverence amounts to worship. They love them and look upon them as revered and sacred men who were enlightened by the light of God. Not only do they revere the ancient *rishis* and regard the love of the past sages as a sacred religious duty, but they also expect the advent of another incarnation of the Deity in this age which they call the *kaljug,* and we have every reason to hope that they will one day accept this heavenly dispensation when they see the signs of God manifested in its support in abundance. Though the ignorant among them have erred in showing excessive reverence for their sacred leaders, yet it cannot be doubted that the extravagances committed in the opposite direction by the Arya Samaj in abusing these sages are far more mischievous. This mischievous calumniation of good men shows conclusively that this plant newly grown on the Indian soil is not rooted in spirituality. True religion subjects its votaries first to a death and then gives them an everlasting life.

When we consider the belief of the Arya Samaj as to God, we find it bordering upon atheism. Though the idol-worshippers are in error in believing that Almighty God has granted to the idols mighty powers on account of which they listen to the prayers of their worshippers, yet it cannot be denied that their error is not so serious as that of the Arya Samaj which robs God of the power of creation and makes matter and soul co-equal with Him. The idol-worshippers do not look upon their idols as co-equal with God. On the other hand, they believe that matter and soul are the creation of God. Such also may have been the true teaching of the Vedas. This Vedic doctrine was revealed to the *rishis* and *munis* who spent their lives in jungles in meditating upon God and in religious devotion. It was for this reason that they did not look upon soul and matter as uncreated and self-existing like God as does the Arya Samaj to-day. They faced every difficulty and underwent every hardship in seeking true connection with God and did not like the Aryas consider their religion to consist in empty words. They kept fasts and chose seclusion in the love of God, and, therefore, that eternal light revealed itself to them. They never thought for a moment that Divine revelation had ceased with the Vedas and that the door had been closed for ever of Almighty God speaking to His true lovers and His righte-

ous servants. They were spoken to by God and the secrets of the future were revealed to them. The truth is that if God should not speak to His true lovers and reveal His glorious face to those who seek Him with true zeal and earnestness, life would be a burden to them. Sad indeed must be their lot if after cutting off all connections for His sake, they are denied His union, and after forsaking every thing for His love, they are still turned out empty-handed.

In short, the great Hindu sages who held personal communion with the Divine Being, never understood the Vedas to mean that God was not the creator of matter and soul. They knew and felt the power of God and, therefore, could not deny its manifestation in creation. The blasphemous doctrine of the eternity of soul and matter which does away with the need of God, was taught by a man who never claimed that He had the same connection with the Divine Being as those ancient sages had. The Sanatan Dharmic belief regarding the Divine Being is far superior to and nobler than the doctrine taught by Daya Nand which divests God of every power.

Another important difference between the Sanatan Dharm and the Arya Samaj is that relating to the *Niyoga*. This doctrine as taught by the Arya Samaj has been explained above. It is totally rejected by the Sanatan Dharma. In fact the chastity of the wife has been held so precious in the Arya Varta from the earliest times that it is unjust to attribute to them the practice of *Niyoga*. The case of the great Hindu sage, Ram Chandra, has already been mentioned. His jealousy for the chastity of his wife was so great as to lead him to destroy her kidnapper and lay waste his country. He did not content himself with the empty solace that there was no harm in an attack upon his wife's chastity as Ravna might raise to her male children according to the doctrine of the *Niyoga*. In fact, chastity was so highly prized in India that when a wife was widowed, she burned herself on the pile of her husband. How could such women be expected to have sexual connection with strangers only to get male children. Nay such children are a disgrace to honorable men and women. The practice of *suttee*, however evil a practice it may be, affords a conclusive evidence that *Niyoga* was never practised in India, for how could the woman who had the habit of going

to strangers entertain such deep love for her husband as to burn herself alive in the flames with his corpse. The Hindu practice of adopting sons also appears to have been resorted to on account of the immorality which the doctrine of *Niyoga* involved. Though adoption too is an unnatural process, yet it was thought far better than subjecting the wife to the immoral practice of the *Niyoga*. *Suttee* and adoption both declare loudly against the doctrine of *Niyoga* taught by the founder of the Arya Samaj.

We earnestly advise the Arya Samaj to reject the doctrine of *Niyoga* at once. Pandit Daya Nand did not claim to be an inspired teacher, and therefore there is no harm in rejecting any part of his teachings so long as the Vedas are adhered to. He could not entertain, on account of his celibate life, the feeling of jealousy which every married man must have, and therefore with respect to the relations of husband and wife, his authority should not be accepted. The Arya Samaj cannot in any way suffer by rejecting this doctrine, and it will certainly gain much.

A Vision.

The Promised Messiah saw in a vision that an order for the spread of plague in four places was handed over to him for execution, but somehow or other the execution of this order remained in delay for a long time, and he felt very sorry in the dream for this delay on his part. The date of this vision is about the 8th of March 1903.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] MAY, 1903. No. 5.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

The Need of the Holy Quran.

(By the Promised Messiah.)

THE great object of Islam being to teach the doctrine of the Unity of God, the question has often been asked what was the need of the Holy Quran when the doctrine of Unity had already been revealed to the world in the Taurat (the Book of the Law of Moses). In answer to this question it should be borne in mind that Judaism no doubt originally taught the doctrine of Unity, but Judaism at the time of the revelation of the Quran was itself corrupt, both in practice and doctrine. The pure religion of the Unity of God had been departed from by the Jews, and the doctrine of Unity contained in their books had no practical effect upon their lives. The grand aim for which man is created and the Word of God revealed, had been utterly lost sight of. The recognition of the Divine Unity consists in a firm belief in the existence of God and His oneness attended with an implicit obedience to Him, complete submission to His will and lasting one's self in His love. The Jewish books taught Unity indeed but the inner life of the Jews was not governed by the noble principle of conduct which underlies the doctrine of the Unity of God, and their hearts were totally devoid of the deep impression of the grandeur and glory of God. Outwardly and formally they recognised Unity but their hearts were turned away from purity and under the control of Satan. Their lives were characterised by every form of iniquity such as worldliness, impure thoughts and affections, deceit and falsehood.

The honor and greatness due to God was given to priests and hermits and disgraceful deeds were done. Hypocrisy and deceit were predominant in the hearts of those who affected to be the teachers and reformers of the people.

Moreover a mere formal recognition of the Unity of God is of no avail if the heart bows down in submission before a thousand different idols. The person who assigns the glory and greatness which is due solely to God, to the means, plans and stratagems which he employs for the realization of an object, or trusts in aught but God, or gives a share of the majesty and power of God to his own-self or to any other creature, is also an idol-worshipper though he may outwardly confess the Unity of God. Idols are not only images made of stone, brass, gold, silver or any other substance, but every object of the reverence and passionate devotion which is due to God, is an idol in the sight of God. The Jewish sacred books however did not teach this noble significance of the doctrine of Unity and the Quran was, therefore, needed for its revelation to the world. The doctrine of the absolute Unity of God precluding faith or trust in everything else besides God was not known to the world until the Holy Quran revealed it. The adoration and reverence of senseless images is an act to which none but the most ignorant and superstitious would resort, but the most dangerous form of idolatry is that which cannot be easily discovered and which affects and vitiates the whole system like an imperceptible but obstinate disease. This lamentable disease prevailed among the Jews and the Bible did not prove an effectual remedy for it, for the Bible did not teach the great truth underlying the Unity of God. The general prevalence of this disease moreover required a perfect living exemplar whose life being governed by this practical principle of the absolute Unity of God should have been a guidance and a direction to mankind and a powerful remedy for destroying the disease.

What is the true doctrine of the Unity of God which the Holy Quran requires us to believe in and which is the only way to salvation? It is to believe in God as one and alone in His person, and above every rival or partner whether it is an idol, or a human

being, or a heavenly body or one's own-self or one's resources, plans or means, not to regard any one as powerful against Him, not to consider any one as the sustainer, the exalter, the abaser, the helper or the supporter as against the will of God, to love Him alone, to worship Him alone, to submit to Him alone, to fear Him alone and to centre all one's hopes in Him alone. There are three requirements for a complete adherence to the doctrine of Unity. Firstly, a man must believe in Unity in the person of God, *i.e.*, he must regard everything as vain and naught before God. Secondly, he must believe in Unity in the attributes of God and consider Divinity and Lordship as the attributes of none besides God, looking upon all those who seem to have an authority as having it from Him. Thirdly, there must be unity in the love, sincerity and devotion which he bears to God; in other words, nothing else must have a share of his love and devotion towards God and of the other aspects of his adoration, and he must be completely lost in Him. These three aspects of the Divine Unity had not been taught by any book before the Quran, and that which had been taught by Moses and the Israelite prophets was not acted upon by the Jews and the Christians. The iniquity and gross immorality in which these people indulged at that time is a clear testimony to the truth of the statement that they admitted the existence of God with their lips, but their hearts were utter strangers to this exalting and noble faith. It is for this reason that the Quran condemns both the Jews and the Christians and says that if these people had acted upon the teachings of Moses and Jesus, they would have been granted sustenance both from heaven and from earth. The heavenly sustenance indicates the spiritual blessings which are granted to the righteous and faithful in heart such as heavenly signs, acceptance of prayer, visions and inspiration. Here they are also declared as having been deprived of earthly sustenance, because they did not obtain it by just and righteous means but by bending low upon earth and making use of vile means.

Israelite Law, no doubt, taught the Unity of God, but the doctrine of Unity taught by it, fell far short of the sublime Unity revealed by the Holy Quran. This defect of teaching in itself

called for a new revelation, while the necessity was further enhanced by the spiritual death of those who professed to inculcate this doctrine. The Jewish doctrine of unity, imperfect as it was, was in their books and not in their hearts. They, therefore, needed a heavenly teacher who should have breathed the soul of Unity into their hearts, and a warm devotion in place of the dull and vapid utterance of formal words. The Jews were dead and life had departed from them on account of the hardness of their hearts and their numerous transgressions. No spark of love for God and not the slightest trace of inclination to spirituality was left in them. Their books on accouut of their defective teachings and the numerous alterations in their letter and spirit could not inspire a new life into, and furnish a perfect guidance to, their votaries or to the world at large. Therefore, Almighty God sent down His living Word like fresh and timely rain and to this word which gave life did He invite them, that they might find life and salvation being purified through it of their former errors and iniquities. The Holy Quran was, therefore, needed in the first place to teach a living Unity to the lifeless Jews; secondly, to inform them of their errors; and thirdly, to throw full light upon all matters relating to eschatology which had been but barely alluded to in the Israelite law.

It is true that the seed of truth was sown with the revelation of Moses while that of Jesus gave the glad tidings of a future when that revelation was to be made perfect. As the seed that grows in a healthy condition gives the glad tidings of good fruits and ears, the Gospel of Jesus gave the glad tidings of the revelation of a perfect law and unerring guide fulfilled in the Holy Quran. The seed which Moses had sown, therefore, ripened with the Quran. The holy book brought with it the perfect blessing which made a clear distinction between truth and falsehood and perfected the religious truths and spiritual verities. This was the purport of Moses' words in Deut. 32: 2, "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; He shined forth from mount Paran." In fact the different phases of law were made perfect only by the Quran. Its two great divisions, the one treating of the relation of man to God and the other of that of man to man, found com-

plete and full development only in the Quran. The object of the Quran was to make the savage a man, to teach the man the highest moral qualities and to make him godly last of all. This function the Holy Book performed with such a success that every other law is a total failure in comparison with it.

The Holy Quran was also needed to settle the differences between the Jews and the Christians relating to Jesus. This it has done in various places. A very important point of difference is that in relation to which the following verse occurs in the Holy Quran: يا عيسى اني متوفيك و رافعك الى و مطهرك من الذين كفروا The Jews asserted as against the Christians that their prophet, *i.e.*, Jesus, had been crucified and that, therefore, according to the law of Moses he was accursed and his soul did not rise to heaven. This argument they advanced as conclusive proof that Jesus was a false prophet. The Christians admitted the curse but said that he had been cursed for their sake, and that subsequently the curse being removed, he rose to heaven where God seated him on His right hand. The verse quoted above condemns both views as serious errors. It states that Jesus did not suffer either a permanent or a temporary curse but that his soul rose to heaven, the happy abode to which the souls of the righteous rise, immediately after his death which did not take place on the cross. The Mosaic Law makes curse the consequence of a death upon the cross and not of a mere suspension on it which does not result in death. The Quran plainly negatives the death of Jesus upon the cross and consequently his subjection to curse and asserts in clear words that his soul like the souls of the righteous rose to heaven after death. Therefore, the Holy Quran refutes both the Jewish and Christian doctrines and asserts that he was not accursed as his enemies and erring friends would have him, but died a pure death and was raised to heaven after his death like all other prophets. Thus did the Holy Quran settle the much vexed question of Jesus' death, but the Christians do not still admit the need of the Quran. The Quran brought the pure doctrine of the absolute Unity of God, it produced harmony between reason and religion, it carried the doctrine of Unity to its perfection, it furnished clear and conclusive arguments for the Unity and attributes of the Divine Being, it gave

reasons based on intellect, history and revelation, for the existence of God, it dressed religion which had up to that time no more value than can be given to a story, in scientific clothing, it clothed every doctrine with true wisdom, it brought to perfection the chain of religious truths which was hitherto imperfect, it took away the curse from Jesus, and it gave evidence of his being a true prophet and of his soul having risen to heaven to live with the righteous. In the face of these facts, no sensible person would assert that the Quran was not needed.

It should be borne in mind that the Quran has itself clearly proved its need. Thus it says: اعلموا ان الله يحى الارض بعد موتها "Know it that the earth had been dead, and God is now going to restore it to life again." History bears evidence to the fact that immediately before the revelation of the Quran every nation had depraved itself and all the people were sunk deep in vice. Pfender notwithstanding his determined enmity to, and blind prejudice against Islam, also bears testimony to the fact that the Jews and the Christians at the advent of our Holy Prophet were corrupt to the core and led grossly immoral lives, though he adds to explain away the appearance of the Holy Prophet that the coming of a false prophet at the time of a general corruption was a warning to the Christians and Jews who had gone astray to reform themselves. Any one having an ordinary share of intelligence will clearly see that this explanation is simply an absurdity and an impertinence. Put in plain words it means that finding the people of the earth in gross errors aud turpitude, God intentionally led them into greater errors and brought about circumstances which led millions of human beings farther away from the right path instead of doing something to bring them back to the truth. Is it true that when God sees the people gone astray, He intentionally leads them to greater destruction, and sends them misleaders and false prophets when they need true guides and reformers? Do the Divine laws as revealed in external nature lend support to this conclusion, and is it thus that God visits the people when sufferings and adversities are unbearable? This is the most blasphemous charge against Divine justice and mercy. To what extreme does the love of this world lead! A weak human being is first called

God and then an accursed person! The righteous prophet of God who delivered the world when it was plunged in evil and restored it to life when it was dead, is denied!

What stronger evidence of the need of the Quran is needed? It came at a time when error raged in the world. It found the world blind and gave it light, it found it in error and gave it guidance, it found it dead and gave it life. The fact that the doctrine of the Unity of God had already been revealed, does not in any way affect the need of the Quran, for as already shown the doctrine of Unity as taught in previous books, was very imperfect and did not aim at the high standard revealed by the Holy Quran. Moreover, even in that imperfect condition, it was only upon the lips and not in the hearts of its adherents, and the Holy Quran was, therefore, needed to impress it upon the hearts, and to make it a living principle for action instead of a formula for repetition. The doctrine of Unity had in fact been quite lost and the Quran brought it afresh to the memory of mankind. The reason why the Holy Quran has been termed ذِكْر or rememberance is that it brought back to the memory that which had been forgotten.

The argument against the need of the Quran, moreover, applies, if there is the least weight in it, with equal force to the Mosaic Law itself, because the doctrine of Unity was not unknown before the revelation of the Law of Moses. Do not even the Jews and the Christians admit that this doctrine had been first revealed and taught to Adam, then to Seth, Noah, Abraham and the other prophets that went before Moses? The revelation of Moses is, therefore, open to the same objection, *viz.*, that it was not needed when the doctrine of Unity was revealed and known before it. The same eternal and unchangeable God who revealed Himself to Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, revealed Himself to Moses, and Moses taught the same Unity which the earlier prophets had taught.

The truth is that the doctrine of the unity and existence of God was not originally taught by the law of Moses but is of ancient origin. We must, therefore, seek the principle which governs its repeated revelation in the world. A cursory glance at the world's

history will show that there have been periods in it when the teaching of Unity has been in its wane and men having left to act upon it, the principle has been held in contempt and disregard. Almighty God has on such occasions raised the prophets and vouchsafed fresh revelation to the world in order to deliver people from the evil and *shirk* into which they have fallen and to bring them back to righteousness and the Unity of God which they have lost. Thousands of times has the doctrine grown rusty and as many times has it been polished and restored to its original purity. With its rustiness its true worth is hidden from the human eye and accordingly for a time it appears to be quite forgotten. A prophet of God, therefore, again appears to manifest its beauty and light and to dispel the darkness from its face. Thus have light and darkness been gaining the supremacy alternately in the world. The most unfailing test that can be applied to judge the claims of a prophet is to see the time when he appears and the transformation which he works. This is the safest method which a seeker after truth should adopt. He should consider with an unprejudiced mind the condition, both as to principles and actions, of the people among whom a prophet appears, before his appearance and after he has done his work. If he comes in time of need and leaves them when that need is satisfied, this is an irrefutable argument of his truth. A prophet is needed to deliver those who are involved in sin in the same manner as a physician is needed to cure the sick.

If any one were to apply this sound test to the claims of our Holy Prophet and compare the pre-Islamic Arabs with the companions of the Holy Prophet, he would be convinced that the Holy Prophet far excelled all other prophets in his sanctifying power, in the wholesomeness of his influence, and in the abundance of his blessings and that the need of the Quran and the Holy Prophet was far more clear and easy of demonstration than the need of any other prophet or book. What great need did Jesus for instance satisfy and what is the proof that he actually did satisfy any need? Did he work any great transformation in the faith, morals and customs of the Jews? Or was he successful in purifying the lives of his chosen apostles? Both questions, we are sorry to note, must be

answered in the negative. All that can be proved is that Jesus had gathered about him a number of avaricious men who were guilty of treachery and faithlessness to their master. Was this the effect of teachings which are boasted as unequalled in their sublimity?

It should also be borne in mind that the Gospel teachings have no superiority over the teachings of the earlier prophets. The teachings contained in the Gospels have on the other hand been all taken from earlier sources including the Talmud. The Jews have always forcibly asserted that there is no originality in the Gospel-teachings but that they are only plagiarisms from Jewish sacred books. One Jewish author has traced whole passages of the teachings of Jesus in the words of earlier sages. But the Christians while admitting this charge of plagiarism would say that the object of Jesus' mission was not to teach morality but to offer his blood as an atonement for the immoralities of the world and to be subjected to curse. This is however a serious error into which they have fallen. They think that the Law was consummated in the Mosaic Law and that, therefore, the Law revealed in the Quran was not needed. The truth is that since men are apt to forget and be remiss in acting upon moral injunctions which are revealed to them through a prophet, a new prophet is required after some time to re-establish the same principles and make men act upon them. Every new age stands in need of a new reformer and a new magnetiser. But the Quran was not needed only to satisfy these two needs ; it was also needed to bring the teachings of the earlier books to completion and perfection. To take one instance only, the Masaic Law laid stress upon vengeance only in all cases, while Jesus taught unconditional forbearance and non-resistance. Both these teachings were required by the special circumstances of the time when they were taught but being one-sided they could not furnish rules for all ages. As the teaching of the extreme vengeance of Mosaic Law was abrogated by the Gospel, the Gospel-teaching of extreme forbearance itself required to be modified. Hence the need of the Holy Quran which teaches the middle path in which the punishment of the offender or forbearance ought to be resorted to as the occasion requires. Thus both the Mosaic Law and the Gospels take the extreme course while the

Quran teaches the golden mean in all cases. The essence of the teaching in all three books is the same, but the first two laid stress only upon one side of the question owing to the peculiar requirements of the time and the circumstances when and under which they were revealed, and the third, meant as it was for the whole future, led men into the mean path to which they could for ever stick. The Mosaic Law takes one extreme and the Gospel the opposite, the one requiring vengeance in all cases and the other unconditional forbearance, but the Holy Quran reveals the wise path of acting according to the occasion. The teachings of the Mosaic Law and the Gospel are thus clothed with true wisdom in the Holy Quran. If the Holy Quran had not come, the law revealed in the Mosaic Law and the Gospel would have been like the arrow shot by a blind man which, if it hits the mark once by chance, goes wide a thousand times. In short, the Pentateuch contained law in the form of stories, and the Gospel taught it in the form of parables, while the Holy Quran presented it to seekers after truth clothed in true wisdom.

The excellent teachings revealed in the Holy Quran are, thus, far above those contained in the Bible. Nay, the whole of the Bible cannot stand against a single short chapter of the Holy Quran entitled the *Fatiha* which contains only seven verses and which discloses such vast treasures of spiritual wisdom, excellent religious truths and the highest and most precious verities arranged in natural order and methodical succession of parts as are not to be met with in the books of Moses and Jesus though one should waste his whole life in turning over their pages. The word of God shows its Divine origin by the Divine power which lies hidden in it just as His handiwork shows His wonderful skill. It should be further remembered that the Holy Quran contains all the directions which are necessary for the perfection of man. The Bible is like an inn which once afforded lodging and rest to wayfarers but after a time heavy storms and violent earthquakes levelled it with the ground. The great building which had once separate apartments for different functions, lay in such waste and total disorganization that the whole was nothing but a heap of bricks. The Lord of this inn took pity on the travellers, and,

therefore, prepared a new inn, more spacious than the first and providing every sort of accommodation and all necessaries for the comfort of the travellers. In its preparation the Lord of the house while making use of some of the bricks of the old building that lay in ruins, added a great deal of fresh material, in order to provide for every requirement of the travellers. This second inn is the Holy Quran: let every one who has eyes behold.

In connection with the perfection of the teachings revealed in the Holy Quran and the imperfection of those revealed to Moses and Jesus, it is necessary to remove an objection. The incompleteness of the earlier teachings is due not to any defect in the Divine revelation, but to a defect in the capability and capacity of those for whom these teachings were meant. The Israelites to whom the mission of Moses was directed had passed about four hundred years in the slavery of the Pharaohs of Egypt, and under this long subjection to the cruelty and tyranny of their masters, they had become as it were utter strangers to principles of justice and equity. As a general rule, the principles to which the masters of a country adhere, find their way into the subject people. People who are in subjection to a tyrant, must after a time grow tyrants in private, while those who are under a just ruler, must grow just in private. The king is as it were a teacher of his people. The Israelites had for many generations been in the bondage of foreign tyrants and their constant subjection to the tyranny and cruelty of their masters fostered in them a spirit which was quite inconsistent with principles of justice and equality. It was, therefore, the first and primary duty of Moses to indoctrinate them in the principles of justice and hence his teachings laid great stress upon this point. The Pentateuch of Moses is not wholly devoid of the teachings of forbearance and mercy but the vein of justice runs through its pages, and its object is also to put a restraint upon undue cruelty and vindictiveness. Such is not the object of the Gospel. It lays stress upon forgiveness and forbearance. The reason of this is not far to seek. The Jews had carried to excess the doctrine of retaliation taught by the Mosaic Law, and instead of kindness and fellow-feeling, rancor and spite had grown up in their hearts. The teaching of Jesus in the Gospels is evidently addressed to a people

whom the speaker knows to be men of a rancorous and vindictive nature and whom he wishes to instruct in the high moral qualities of kindness, patience, forbearance and forgiveness to which they are utter strangers. Hence the propriety of the teachings of Moses and Jesus is unquestionable though it cannot be denied that both doctrines were like special or local laws, and from their very nature unsuitable for permanent and universal adoption. The true and universal law was revealed in the Holy Quran which abrogated all previous laws. Any one who enters into the spirit of the Holy Book and goes to the depth of its true significance, will clearly see that the Quran has neither laid stress upon strict vengeance as the Mosaic Law did in its doctrine of retaliation and its battles, nor has it gone to the opposite extreme by emphasising absolute and unqualified forgiveness of all injuries, but adopts the middle path by enjoining that which is right and forbidding that which is wrong. It requires us to do that which is right both according to reason and law, and to refrain from doing what reason and law do not permit. The laws and injunctions of the Quran do not, therefore, relate to particular actions but lay down general rules for a right course of conduct. It does not for instance tell us to take an eye for an eye in every case or to forgive every injury however evil its consequences may be, but tells us to apply our reason and judgment to the circumstances of every case and act in a manner which is likely to produce the greatest good. By enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong, the Holy Quran has given us general laws for our guidance and thus introduced scientific principles in religious injunctions. Before proceeding to take any step, we are required to consider what will actually be the right way? Whether it is right to forgive or punish, or to give in charity or not to give, is a question of circumstances in each case. According to the Quranic teachings therefore, our primary consideration in every case should be the propriety of the occasion.

We have so far discussed every side of the question relating to the need of the Quran. One point only remains to be considered. Did Islam wage war with the Jews and the Christians to compel them to accept its doctrines? This asserted compulsion has no basis at all. Islam never took the initiative in the battles which it had to fight. It was compelled to take up the sword against those who

had either aggressed on it or assisted the aggressors. The jealousy of God was, therefore, moved to punish the offenders. But His mercy still saved from the deserved punishment such as accepted Islam or paid the *jizya*. This favor was also in accordance with the Divine laws, for whenever there is a visitation of God such as a famine or a plague, the hearts of men are naturally turned to humbleness, repentance, prayers and charitable deeds to avert the Divine punishment. This shows clearly that God Himself inspires into the hearts of men a remedy for averting the evil. The ardent prayers of Moses averted many a time the punishment of the Israelites. In short the Islamic fights were a punishment from God to the aggressors, in which the way was still open for repentance and obtaining the mercy of God.

It cannot be denied that the early Muslim wars were not undertaken to compel the Jews and Christians to accept the doctrine of Unity preached by Islam. Wars were resorted to at the express command of the Almighty as a punishment for the offenders who either took up arms against the holy faith for its extirpation or assisted the aggressors or laid obstructions in the way of Islam intending to hinder its progress. These three causes necessitated a severe chastisement of the offenders and Almighty God willed that it should be effected by means of the sword. Another unjust and unwarrantable charge against Islam is that it preached peace during the first thirteen years under the most cruel tortures and persecutions of its enemies because it lacked force at that time, but that as soon as it had sufficient force to make its appearance in the field of battle it declared war. Such a charge would have had some foundation if the opponents of the Holy Prophet had not committed the heinous deeds of cruelty and innocent bloodshed or plotted to take away his life as they did at Mecca, and the prophet had left Mecca of his own accord and not on account of their evil designs. The slightest acquaintance with the circumstances of the Prophet's life at Mecca, would convince every sensible person of the unreasonableness of such a supposition. Even the enemies of Islam cannot deny—nay they have borne testimony to the fact—that the Holy Prophet met the rejection and persecutions of his enemies with great fortitude and strictly enjoined

forbearance and non-resistance of evil upon his companions. There was no end to the severe persecutions of his enemies. They shed the blood of many an innocent person and inflicted wounds and injuries upon whomsoever they could lay their hands on. An attack upon the Prophet himself was at last plotted to bring the whole movement to an end. At this critical moment, Almighty God led His messenger out of all danger to Medina and gave him the glad tidings that those who had taken up the sword against Islam would perish by the sword. Do these circumstances lend the least support to the cruel charge that the Prophet was from the very commencement bent upon war and that this cherished idea took a practical shape when he found himself at the head of an army at Medina? Is it not true that when the Meccans advanced towards Medina, and were met by the Moslems at the famous field of Badr, the ranks of the Muslims contained no more than 313 men of whom very few had any experience of war and the majority were young men who had never fought a battle before? Nay, among these three hundred and thirteen were also boys who had not yet grown to manhood. Could this small number of raw young men be relied upon as a sufficient force to meet the sturdy warriors and Bedouin hordes of the whole idolatrous Arabia and the thousands of Jews and Christians who were bent upon extirpating the new faith? Could a general ever make his appearance in the field with such scanty material to deal destruction to innumerable foes? Does it not clearly prove that the Prophet was obliged to take the sword in obedience to the commandment of God and not to fulfil any plan which he had concerted? Had it been his plan he would have first collected a force of thirty or forty thousand strong and then made his appearance into the field of battle?

Custom and Tradition

AND

THEIR RESPECTIVE VALUE IN MUHAMMADAN LAW.

(By the Promised Messiah.)

Next to the Holy Quran, the Muhammadans have been given *sunnat* (custom) for their guidance in religion. *Sunnat* is the custom

of the Holy Prophet or the explanation and application of the injunctions of the Holy Quran in the practical life of the Holy Prophet. The Holy Quran enjoins the observance of prayer, for instance, but it does not explicity fix the number of *rak'ats* for each different prayer. But custom fully explains this and all other injunctions of the Holy Quran which need to be done practically for their due observance. To regard custom and tradition as one thing is an error. Custom came into existence along with every injunction that was revealed in the Holy Quran, and it was fully established by the Prophet himself in his own life-time, whereas the sayings of the Prophet remained in the course of oral transmission for more than a century after the Holy Prophet and were then collected and arranged. The Holy Quran and the custom are simultaneous whereas tradition properly belongs to a later period. Almighty God and His Holy Prophet had charge of two things only. Almighty God made known His will to the world through His Word, while the Holy Prophet's duty it was to explain the injunctions of the Quran in a practical way. This he did by turning the injunctions into practice and thus expounding the maxims of the law. It is an error to regard tradition as giving the necessary details. Before tradition was collected and recorded, Islam had been fully established upon earth and its ordinances were the guiding rules of the lives of millions of human beings. Prayers were observed, alms given and pilgrimages performed in accordance with the requirements of the law, and all distinctions between things allowed and prohibited, had been clearly marked out long before the collection of tradition. All these things, therefore, depend upon the Holy Quran and custom and not upon tradition.

Tradition no doubt occupies the third place in Muslim Law and throws light upon many historical problems, adds to the ethical code of Islam and assists in the application of the general principles of the Holy Quran to particular circumstances. It is like a servant in its relation to the Holy Quran and the custom. The *Ahl-i-hadis* confound custom with tradition and include both the sayings and the practice of the Holy Prophet under the name of tradition. But facts do not lend any support to this view. Custom was established under the direct care of the Holy Prophet, and this part of the law without which the injunctions of the Holy Quran would not have passed into

the domain of the practical was in his own immediate charge, while tradition was not collected and classified to serve as a guide on doctrinal points until after the death of the Prophet and even his companions. Tradition, therefore, does not supersede or govern the Holy Quran and the custom but serves as an auxiliary to them. All important and essential principles and practices have been established by the Holy Quran and the custom, while tradition casts light upon secondary and minor points.

The value of each of these three sources of Muslim Law is, therefore, varying. The Holy Quran is the pure and unaltered Word of God and its authority on all points is unquestionable. Custom is the practical course of life into which the Holy Prophet guided his companions and which has since been followed by all true Muslims. The authority of custom though second to the Holy Quran, is far superior to that of tradition, because it was established by the Prophet himself and handed down to us through a safe medium. But the same reliance cannot be accorded to tradition as to the Holy Quran and the custom. Its authority is only admissible when it does not contradict the Holy Quran and the custom. Tradition is subsidiary to the Holy Quran and the custom and possesses a vast treasure of religious doctrines and, therefore, its utter rejection is the cutting off of one of the three branches of Muslim Law. There is no doubt that we cannot place the same confidence in tradition as in the Holy Quran and the custom, and must dismiss as a pure fabrication every narrative which contradicts the Holy Quran and the custom or traditions which agree with them, but still it is a very serious error to regard the whole mass of tradition as a pure fabrication. Every tradition must be honored which is true when tested by the touch-stone of the Holy Quran and the custom, for the ultimate source to which it may be traced is the Prophet himself. Do not deny it until the Holy Quran and the custom give it the lie, lest you should reject the word of the Holy Prophet. Nay, you should be so scrupulous about it that you should not do, or forbear from doing, an act unless you have a tradition in support of it. If you find a tradition contradicting the words of the Holy Quran, try to put upon its words a construction which should reconcile it to the Holy Quran. But if such a reconciliation is not possible in any case, reject the tradition for it cannot be from

the Prophet. If a tradition is borne out by the Holy Quran, its authority is unquestionable though its authenticity may have been called into question by the collectors. In like manner if you come across a tradition involving a prophecy which has been fulfilled in your own time or previous to it, know it for certain that it is the word of the Prophet and condemn the opinion of those who have questioned its authenticity and truthfulness, for by bringing it to fulfilment Almighty God has Himself sealed its truth. If you reject such a tradition because some collectors or compilers of tradition have pronounced it to be unworthy of credit, you are guilty of rejecting an argument for the truth of Islam. In that case you are an enemy of Islam and not its friend. Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: فلا يظهر على غيبه احدا الا من ارتضى من رسول "God does not reveal His deep secrets except to such of His chosen apostles as He is pleased with." Hence a true prophecy cannot be attributed to any but a true prophet of God. If a compiler has pronounced a tradition to be unauthentic or fabricated which has afterwards been shown to be true by the fulfilment of the prophecy which it reveals, it is easy to see that the error must be attributed to the judgment of the compiler. What a folly to assert that Almighty God committed a mistake in showing the truth of that which was really false!

Along with this respect for traditions it is necessary to warn the reader against their abuse. The gigantic mass of tradition contains an immense amount of fictitious material. Tradition opened up for every section dissenting from the true faith a vast field for fabrication to support its own views. Each sect thus came to have its own traditions and their variance at last affected even the unity of custom in certain cases. Custom, for instance, did not teach more than a single way of saying prayers, yet tradition even in this case splitted the Muslims into many sects. An erroneous view of the authority of traditions has led astray many sections of Islam. In this lies the error of the Shias too. The same error led astray the Jews who placed too great a confidence in their traditions to the utter neglect of the Word of God. They trusted in the traditions which plainly said that Elijah would descend from heaven before the coming of Jesus Christ and rejected the interpretation which Jesus put on the Word of God that by the coming of Elijah was meant the coming

of one in his power and spirit, because their traditions told them a bodily and not a spiritual descent of Elijah. Among the collections of Muslim tradition, the Bokharee is a sacred and trustworty book. It is the book which like the Quran plainly speaks of the death of Jesus Christ. In like manner, the work of Muslim and other collections of traditions are depositaries of important religious truths, and the traditions narrated in them must be acted upon by all true Muslims subject to the condition that they do not contradict the Holy Quran and the custom.

Certainty in Faith.

(By the Promised Messiah.)

Seekers after truth! Open your ears and listen to the words which I speak that there is no wealth in the world equal to certainty in faith. It is certainty which breaks the shackles of sin. It is certainty that gives you the power of doing deeds of virtue. It is certainty and certainty alone which makes a man a true and sincere lover of God. Can you keep from sin without certainty? Have you the power to overcome the passions of flesh without witnessing a manifestation of certainty? Do you think that your lives can be transformed to purity unaided by the light of certainty? Is it possible for you to attain to true happiness without certainty? Does there exist under heaven any redemption or atonement which can take away your sins? Has the son of Mary the power to release you from the bondage of sin with his supposed blood? Speak not a lie at which the earth might cleave asunder, for Jesus himself stood in need of certainty for his own salvation. To him it was granted and therefore he was saved. Woe to the Christians who deceive the world by saying that they have been purified of their sins by the blood of Jesus, whereas they are soaked in sin from head to foot. They do not know who their God is. They are drunk with wine but the pure intoxication which descends from heaven is not known to them. They do not lead their lives in the service of the Master, and are, therefore, devoid of the spiritual blessings granted to the pure in life. Remember that except by the light of certainty you cannot come out of a life of darkness nor can the holy spirit descend

upon you. Blessed are they who have found the wealth of certainty for they shall see God. Blessed are they whose doubts are set at rest for they shall be delivered from sin. Blessed are you when the wealth of certainty is given to you for then you shall cease to sin. Sin vanishes away where certainty finds an entrance. Can you thrust your hand into a hole in which you see a poisonous serpent or stand in a place where a volcano is raining stones, or where lightning is falling or which is the haunt of a ferocious lion or where destructive plague prevails? If you have the same certainty about the destructive nature of sin as about the destruction which volcanic matter or a plague works, it is impossible that you should disobey God's commandments and go against His will or break off the connection of sincerity and love with Him.

Ye people that have been invited to virtue and righteousness, know it for certain that the Divine attraction cannot be generated in you nor the impure stain of sin washed off from your faces until your hearts flow with certainty. If you think that your lifeless traditional belief gives you certainty, it is nothing but a delusion. Had you the desired certainty, you would not have been destitute of its consequences. You do not keep back from sin, you do not eschew evil, you do not take the forward step that you ought to take and you do not fear God as you ought to fear Him. Where is your certainty then? Do you ever thrust your hand into a hole when you are certain that it has a poisonous snake? Can you take a single morsel of a food which you certainly know to be poisoned? Or can you go inadvertently and unguarded into a jungle which you certainly know to be the abode of man-eaters? How is it then that your hands, and your feet, and your eyes, and your ears are bold in the commission of sin, notwithstanding your alleged certainty in relation to God and the reward and punishment of good and evil deeds. Sin cannot overcome certainty. How can you throw yourselves into burning and consuming fire when you see it with your eyes? The citadels of certainty rise high to heaven, and Satan cannot ascend them. If any one has been purified, it is through certainty that he has found this blessing. Certainty gives the power to meet every hardship, so much so that it makes the monarch throw away the royal sceptre and don the garments of a *darvesh*. Certainty lightens the labour and smooths

the path. Certainty enables a man to see God. Every atonement is false and every redemption vain, for to righteousness there is no other way but certainty. It is certainty which releases a man from the bondage of sin, carries him to God and makes him surpass even the angels in his sincerity and perseverance. The religion that has not the means to bring about a certainty, is false. The religion which cannot show the face of the living God with certainty, is false. The religion which has nothing but idle tales of the marvels of the past, is false. The eternal and unchangeable God is even now as He was in the past ages, and His wonderful powers are the same as they were ere now, and He has the same might to show His wonderful signs as He had at any previous time. Why then trust in tales and not seek the living manifestations of the power of God? That religion is nothing but the way to perdition whose miracles and prophecies are stories and those people are ruined to whom God has not revealed Himself and who have not been purified by the hand of God through certainty. As a man is drawn to indulgence in his carnal passions on account of the animal gratification which he feels in them, similarly he is attracted to God with a mighty magnetism when he has once tasted the heavenly bliss. His beauty then so enchants him that all else besides Him is naught to him. No man is ever freed from the slavery of sin unless he has a certain knowledge of God and His power and of the reward and punishment of good and evil deeds. The root from which every insolence grows is the lack of certainty, and the person who has any access to a certain knowledge regarding the Divine Being, dare not go against His will. If the owner of the house knows that a heavy flood is sure to sweep away his house or that it has caught fire and a very small space is left, he cannot stay in the house. How do you then, notwithstanding your pretensions to certainty as to the reward and punishment of good and evil deeds, remain in the dangerous condition in which you are? Open your eyes and consider the Divine laws which you see working in the world. Be not the rats which go downwards but be the pigeons which fly upwards and ascend into the height of the heaven. Do not turn to sin after you have sworn repentance and be not like the serpent which after stripping off its skin is still the same old serpent. Remember death for it is coming nearer you and you are unaware of its approach. Try to purify yourselves for no one who is not himself

purified can see the Holy One. But how can you find this blessing? Almighty God Himself has shown you the way and said: واستعينوا بالصبر والصلوٰة "Seek the assistance of God with patience and with prayer." Prayer must be addressed to God with true humbleness of heart and must contain the praise and sanctification of God, *istighfar* and the invoking of Divine blessings on the Holy Prophet. When you say your prayers, do not like the ignorant deem it a sin to utter words in your prayer in any but the sacred language. Their *istighfar* and prayers are only lifeless ceremonies. Therefore, when you say your prayers, address your supplications to God with humility and submissiveness in your own language, reciting the passages of the Holy Quran which is the Word of God and the prayers taught by the Holy Prophet in the Arabic language, for when you pray to God in your own language, your words have a greater efficacy and your hearts, as they realize the depth of the meaning of these words, bow down before God with greater submission.

The Five Daily Prayers

REPRESENT THE FIVE-FOLD CONDITION OF MAN.

(By the Promised Messiah)

What are the five daily prayers? They are photographs of your changing conditions. The life of man is subject to five different changes which he undergoes in the time of adversity. These five changes are necessary to human nature. First of all you are informed of the misfortune that is going to befall you, as for instance when a warrant is issued from a court of justice for your arrest. For the first time then your comfort and happiness is suddenly interrupted and a cloud of melancholy is cast over your sunshine of glory. This stage corresponds to the time for the first prayer immediately after noon. As the sun begins to decline from the zenith after noon, so a man who is at the height of his prosperity and success witnesses the first stage of his declination when he comes to know of an impending misfortune. This stage of the human condition finds its representation in the prayer which is said at the first decline of the sun, *i.e.*, the *zuhr* prayer. The sun declines farther to the west and the troubles increase. In the illustration already stated, the person upon whom the warrant is executed, is brought before the magistrate. Difficulties then encom-

pass him all around, and the light of comfort is on the verge of extinction. Corresponding to this state of man is the time of the day when the sun has declined far to the west and his light is turned pale so that the eye can rest upon him. The zenith of glory is left far behind and the setting of the sun after a short time is apparent. The later after-noon prayer, *i.e.*, *'asr*, answers to this spiritual state. A third change then comes over the man. There is no hope left of being delivered from the trouble. To continue the illustration already suggested, evidence being taken against the accused person which shows his guilt a charge is framed by the Magistrate. He is then frighted out of his senses and deems himself already a prisoner. The son of glory is then set. This state corresponds to the time when the sun is actually set and the light of the day vanishes away. The evening prayer said after sunset represents this condition. The culminating point of adversity is reached when darkness encompasses a man all around, and its force is fully realized. The verdict goes against the person charged and he is thrown into a dungeon. Thus a night comes over the day of prosperity even as it actually comes after sunset when the last rays of light having disappeared, complete darkness pervades on the face of the earth. The prayer fixed for this time is the night-prayer which is thus the fourth representative of a man's condition in adversity. The night passes away and the rays of light once more beam upon the person who has been surrounded with difficulties. The mercy of God takes the prisoner by the hand and sets him free. The morning comes after the long hours of night and before its light dispels the clouds of darkness. This spiritual state of man is represented by the fifth or morning prayer.

It will be seen from this that the five daily prayers represent five changes in the fortune of a man and the time of the day at which Almighty God has appointed a particular prayer to be said represents a particular phase of fortune. The prayers are, therefore, for your own benefit. If you wish that the adversities which are in store for you should not befall you, say your prayers at the appointed times for they are images of the external and internal changes in your conditions. Prayer is a remedy for future adversities. You do not know what to-morrow has in store for you: pray, therefore, to God before the new sun rises that the new day may bring you happiness and blessings.

Jesus among the Ten Lost Israelite Tribes in the East, III.

EVIDENCE FROM THE GOSPELS--3.

Writing under this heading in two previous numbers we showed on the basis of statements from Gospel narratives that Jesus Christ was saved the accursed death on the cross. We have not met with any refutation of these arguments though three months have elapsed since their publication except the single remark that such inferences are opposed to the uniform tenor of the Gospels. Now this supposed uniform tenor does not exist anywhere outside the minds of some Christian Missionaries. The narratives of the Gospels present so many contradictions that they can hardly be supposed to relate the same story. No amount of turning and twisting the meaning of words can make the story one complete narrative. The judicious reader is, therefore, bound to reject all absurdities and take for the basis of a life of Jesus that which appears to be historically true, for otherwise the whole narrative shall have to be condemned as a fiction. As already shown, there are numerous passages in the Gospels proving conclusively that Jesus did not die on the cross. Should they be rejected as interpolations or fabrications? What must be done for instance with the prophecy which says that no sign shall be given to the Jews except the sign of Jonas the prophet? Unless the prophecy is declared false, there is no escaping the conclusion that Jesus was placed alive in the grave just as Jonas went alive into the belly of the whale. No other resemblance can be traced between the two prophets. Many attempts have been made by the Christian apologists to evade the difficulty but they are all futile. What again are we to do with the dream of Pilate's wife recorded in Matt. 27 : 19? Are we to suppose it to be of a diabolical origin, or should we regard the narrative which gives it, as fictitious? No Christian would assent to these propositions. What was its purpose then? Is it not clear that it was designed to bring about the liberation of Jesus? Why did God send an angel to warn Pilate through his wife that Jesus should not die, if it was not His will that Jesus should be saved? Was the purpose of God frustrated by some mightier agency?

There is a similar instance afforded to us in the nativity story where the life of the child Jesus is saved by a similar warning through a dream. Does not a comparison of the dreams in these two instances clearly show that it was the Divine purpose that Jesus should not die on the cross? If the dream is not intended to serve this purpose, the Christians had better condemn it as a fiction. In what manner again is the prayer of Jesus in the garden to be dealt with? He was "exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," when he fell on his face before God and in true humbleness offered up the prayer that the fatal cup might, if possible, be taken away from him without his tasting it. Who knows how heavy and depressed he was on that night and with what deep agony he continued to cry out to His God the whole night long. The sleeping disciples were only now and then awakened by his loud cries. How great was his suffering and how earnest his desire to escape the accursed death on the cross, may be guessed from the fact that he was unable to suppress his deep sorrow and gave vent to it in loud cries which were uttered with a sufficient volume to disturb* the sleep of his disciples at a very long distance. No sensible person would doubt for a moment that all those cries which a chosen prophet of God had uttered in great and continued agony, could not but move the merciful God to compassion. If the prayer of Jesus in this agony was rejected by God, no Christian should have the least hope of the acceptance of his prayers. Nay, it was simply absurd that Jesus laid so much stress on prayer if his own prayer under the heaviest affliction was doomed to utter rejection. The idea of the rejection of this prayer is further contradicted by Heb. 5 : 7, where it is stated in plain words that this prayer was accepted by God. But if Jesus died upon the cross, the account of this prayer must be looked upon as fictitious.

Moreover, the short duration for which Jesus remained on the cross and the post-crucifixion incidents narrated in the Gospels lead

* It is on this supposition only that the record of this prayer in the Gospels can be explained, for the general body of the disciples was not with Jesus on this occasion (Matt. 26: 36) and the three whom he took with him and who were at the distance of about a stone's throw from him (Luke 22: 41) were all asleep. But as the prayer has been recorded they must have been awakened now and then by the shrieks which Jesus uttered in his agony and thus overheard him.

to but one conclusion, *viz.*, that Jesus did not die upon the cross, and the "uniform tenor" contradicting this conclusion is nothing more than a false belief which pervades all thoughts of the Christians. There is not a single instance on record in which a two or three hours' suspension on the cross may have brought about the death of a person. Nay, there are instances in which a person has been saved even after being subjected to this lingering mode of execution for a day or two. Josephus has related an incident in which he begged release from the Emperor of three persons who had been nailed to the cross for a long time, at least over a day as the circumstances show, and by the application of proper remedy the life of one was saved. In fact, the great tardiness of death by crucifixion totally subverts the orthodox position of the death of Jesus upon the cross within the short duration of two or three hours. The futility of the orthodox contention is further made evident by the fact that in the particular case of Jesus and the two thieves, the duration of suspension was regarded quite insufficient to bring about death, and hence it was thought necessary to subject them further to the process of crurifragium which in most cases was employed as a distinct punishment to bring about the death of the offender. The effect of crucifixion was, therefore, considered as almost null in their case and hence the necessity of subjecting them to another torturous mode of punishment which even without crucifixion would have brought about death. It should be borne in mind that crurifragium consisted in breaking, with hammers or clubs, the bones of the offender from the hips to the feet. Now this process was intentionally omitted in the case of Jesus and the pretence was advanced that he was already dead. With the two thieves whose duration of suspension on the cross was the same as that of Jesus, still needing the punishment of the crurifragium which alone could have caused death, we are asked to believe that Jesus was already dead! The spear-wound further decided the question that life had not ceased because it is stated that blood and water flowed from the wound. Now the flowing of water is nothing more than a fiction invented for translating the event from the domain of the natural into that of the supernatural. No water could have flowed even if the wound had been so deep as to reach the precordial region except in case of dropsy, and this we do

not suppose is meant by the narrator. The flowing of blood however shows that life had not ceased, for blood is congealed within a few minutes after death. The fact that it was fluid conclusively shows that Jesus did not die upon the cross and that he was still alive like the thieves when taken down. It has been further alleged that the piercing of Jesus' side with a spear was a substitute for the crurifragium employed on the thieves. This is an absolute misrepresentation of the facts of the case. The soldiers had no authority to substitute one mode of causing death for another. To put an end to the life which the short duration of the crucifixion could not extinguish, the soldiers were directed to employ the crurifragium and they had not the authority to substitute a different method. But the narrative shows conclusively that the breaking of legs though resorted to in the case of the thieves was not employed in the case of Jesus. It is not stated how the soldiers came to know that Jesus was already dead. It is so hard to distinguish between a case of syncope which must be a natural consequence of crucifixion, and actual death that considering the low state of the medical science at that age even a doctor could have erred. But the writers of the Gospels ask us to submit to the opinion of one or two ignorant soldiers in the face of the strongest testimony which leads to a contrary conclusion. That the piercing with the spear which caused the flow of blood gave a fatal wound and affected the precordia is not supported by the slightest evidence. Moreover it was the side that was pierced and not the precordia and there is no evidence to show that the wound was a deep one. To strike the precordia and cause the flow of blood by that means, a great deal of skill was required which could not be expected from an ignorant soldier. Just as a pretence was advanced in the first instance that crucifixion had put an end to Jesus' life and that, therefore, recourse to crurifraguim was unnecessary, so the slight wound in the second instance may have been pretended to be sufficiently fatal to cause death. But as the flow of blood from the wound showed that Jesus had not died upon the cross, so later circumstances and the absence of the employment of any method to cause actual death, afford conclusive evidence that the wound was nothing more than a scratch.

Thus there is not the slightest evidence of the death of Jesus in the

material furnished by the Gospels, and so far as other historical sources are concerned which we shall consider later on, we have clear evidence in hand that Jesus did not actually die on the cross. The single statement by some unknown person that Jesus was dead upon the cross has been contradicted in the Gospels themselves by the incident of the flow of blood. The Gospel of John thus gives the lie to the statement of those who hold Jesus to have died on the cross and establishes conclusively that he was taken down alive from the cross. This even the Christian apologists have been obliged to admit, for otherwise the Gospel of John must be condemned as a monstrous falsehood. The episode of the flow of blood thus contradicts all assertions of the death of Jesus on the cross. These assertions being, therefore, clearly falsified, there is no evidence whatever of the death of Jesus. The assertion of Jesus' rising from the dead contradicts our unvarying experience. The evidence required to establish it must, therefore, be unparalleled in its force. The mere fact of a man being seen alive of whose death we have no proof, is no argument for his resuscitation though it may be a good argument for his recovery if he has undergone severe torture. History shows that many persons have been restored to life after being hung on the cross and for longer periods than Jesus was hung. Shall we then have to suppose that they actually rose from the dead? Metaphorically such a description may not be objectionable for the world gives them up for dead men. It is in this sense that Jesus tells his disciples that after he is risen again, he shall go before them into Galilee. If any value is to be attached to the post-crucifixion appearances of Jesus, the strongest evidence is required to establish his death, for the natural conclusion from such appearances is not that he rose from the dead but that he never died. The amount of evidence required to establish the fact of Jesus' death is not found in the Gospels. There is no conclusive proof that Jesus died, and, therefore, the evidence of the Gospels establishes not a resuscitation but a recovery. The absence of any evidence of a serious kind as to the reality of Jesus' death has been felt in all ages. Even at the time of crucifixion, Pilate gave utterance to his opinion that Jesus could not die so soon. From that early time doubts have been entertained as to the reality of his death by his friends as well as foes, the former adhering blindly to the belief that

the death was brought about by a supernatural intervention though the circumstances could not bring it about. The Gospels present a strange self-contradiction. They first ask us to believe that death had actually occurred upon the cross and then relate an incident showing the flow of blood from the side of Jesus after he was taken down from the cross. If the first statement is not attributed to ignorance, as the determination of death requires accurate medical skill, the Gospels must be condemned as self-contradictory. Had there been any assertion that death occurred after the piercing of the side, the allegation of the death of Jesus after being taken down from the cross, would have had to be seriously considered though it still would have been open to the objection that like the allegation of his death upon the cross which was belied by the Gospels themselves, it was nothing more than a falsehood. But unfortunately for the Christian apologists, there is no circumstance or assertion showing the death of Jesus after the piercing episode. Hence the burden lies upon the Christians of bringing forward conclusive proof as to the death of Jesus before offering any evidence of his so-called resurrection.

Of the appearances of Jesus after crucifixion, we have already said that they conclusively show that he was possessed of human organism and that the astral body is simply a myth. Every circumstance attending his appearance besides revealing a human organism and human needs, shows clearly the same progress in the regaining of strength as might be expected in the case of recovery from severe wounds and consequent weakness. In the first place he requires two or three days before he is able to come out of the grave. It is simply absurd to suppose that these three days were required for rising from among the dead and the circumstance only points to his recovery from weakness and loss of consciousness. Then he finds himself so weak from the wounds and torture of the cross that he is unable to undertake any long journey at once, but first walks about in the garden, then goes a few miles from the city and at last when sufficient strength is gained, he at once leaves for a quieter place, *i.e.*, Galilee, a place which had been appointed beforehand as the meeting place. All this he does in disguize and takes care that his enemies may remain altogether in the dark as to his whereabouts. That he remained under careful medical treatment from the time that

Joseph took him in his charge, is not a mere conjecture, but a fact established on the very strong evidence furnished by the "Ointment of Jesus," of which however we shall speak later on.

Enough has been said already as to the perfectly human nature of the body of Jesus, in which he appeared to his disciples after crucifixion, and we do not wish to detain the reader any more on this point. We shall, however, call the reader's attention to one or two points more. In Matt. 27: 52, 53, we meet with another piece of evidence which leads us to the conclusion we have already reached. It is there said that "the graves were opened and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection and went into the holy city and appeared unto many." Undoubtedly the story of so many saints coming out of their graves and appearing to many is not an historical event. If the occurrence of such events were possible in this world, the general resurrection would no more be an unseen thing, and all the truths of the life to come that have been kept hidden from the physical eye of men as a criterion for their sincerity and faith, would become evident to all. The fact that there is a life hereafter would then become palpably evident, alike to the believers and unbelievers, and its existence as apparent as that of the material things of this world.

Again, if it were true that hundreds of thousands of the Israelite prophets and saints had risen after the crucifixion and entered the holy city, and that such a miracle had been wrought to prove the truth of Jesus' mission, the Jews had a good opportunity of learning from all these saints and prophets who were their own forefathers whether Jesus was true in his claim to Divinity. It is also evident that the Jews, who had an anxious desire to converse with the dead, would not have lost so favourable an opportunity when thousands of dead men walked up into the different quarters of the city. They must have asked questions concerning the man whom they had crucified. The story of Jesus and his mission must have been on the lips of everybody and freely discussed in every family, for there was a good opportunity of solving this all-important question on the authority of the dead whose evidence could not be refuted. Such evidence, it appears, was not favourable to Jesus, and the risen saints must have

told the Jews that Jesus' claim to godhead was a pure fabrication; for after this event the Jews, instead of accepting his mission became more averse to it. Their hearts hardened and waxed more gross after they had learned the real nature of things from thousands of the old prophets and saints restored to life through the miraculous power of Jesus. They became more and more inclined to mischief, and not satisfied with the death of Jesus, their vengeance was now directed against his followers. We cannot understand how the Jews could have rejected Jesus when thousands of saints whose bodies rested in that holy land had risen and publicly testified in their presence that Jesus was in fact the Son of God, and that whosoever did not believe in him as such would go to hell. If, therefore, we suppose that the saints and prophets came out of their graves and went to the holy city to give to the people true information about Jesus, their evidence must have been against him, and his claims to sonship and godhead, if he ever put forward such claims, must have been falsified by them. Perhaps, this very evidence made the Jews more obstinate in their opposition to Jesus and instead of admitting him a God they rejected him even as a prophet.

In short, it is the very height of absurdity to believe that Jesus raised hundreds of thousands of dead bodies at the time of his crucifixion, or, that he ever raised any single dead body before that time, for no good seems to have come from the wonders said to be performed by Jesus. The following illustration throws some light on the futility of the orthodox attempt to establish that Jesus ever raised any dead person. Some persons went to a distant country, and saw the wonders and curiosities of that land such as they had never seen before. After the lapse of a long period of time, the travellers paid a visit to their native land. Now, during the time that they were away, a certain man of low and humble appearance, came to this country and stated that he was the monarch of the country to whose capital the travellers had gone. He also stated that certain other great rulers known to the people of this country were inferior to him in rank. The people of the country not believing his statements, went to the travellers to enquire who the claimant was. Now, these travellers knew the claimant very well. It was but natural that they should have satisfied the enquirers and so they told them all they

knew. The result of the enquiry was that the people looked upon the claimant as an impostor, and tortured him and drove him out from amongst them. Imagine what the travellers might have told about him, for had they spoken well of him, the people would have honored and respected him. This parable is a good illustration of the case of Jesus. His raising the dead could only have been accepted if the opinion of the dead, which the public would naturally have been anxious to learn, had been favourable to him. But here the result is quite the reverse of what one should expect. If we suppose that Jesus had raised the dead, we are at the same time obliged to admit that the dead did not bear a testimony which established the truth of his assertions, but that their evidence led to still further opposition. The weak point in this otherwise extraordinary feat is thus easily exposed. To conceal the blemish, the narrators should have stated that Jesus restored so many animals to life, for in that case no one could have questioned the authenticity of the miracle on the ground of the absence of favorable evidence. The fact of accepting a religion on the authority of those who have tasted of the life after death—if their coming back into the world were possible—is so clear that even if the Hindus were asked whether they would accept a religion as true which was testified to as such by their dead forefathers miraculously restored to life, the answer would certainly be in the affirmative.

The Christians do not stand alone in ascribing such a miracle to Jesus, for the Sikhs mention a similar story about Nanak, the founder of their religion. But the latter have shown more ingenuity in their invention than the Christians, inasmuch as they state that Nanak had once restored a dead elephant to life. Now such a miracle is not open to the objection which has already been forwarded against the raising of the dead bodies of men, for the elephant, even if really raised to life, could not have testified to the truth or falsehood of Nanak. In fine, the ignorant people may feel proud of such miracles, but the wise man finds such absurdities abhorrent to his nature, and feels ashamed when other people raise just and reasonable objections.

We would now try to explain what is the reality contained in the Gospel narrative of the rising of the dead bodies of the saints and

their coming into the holy city; for our love and respect for Jesus is far greater than that of the Christians who know not whom they admire. The fact is that this very event, which has been so much talked of, was a vision seen by some righteous person. This vision was to the effect that the dead saints had risen and paid visits to the people of the holy city. But the dream is not to be taken in a literal sense but must be interpreted in the same way as other dreams in the Holy Books of God, the dream of Joseph for instance. The interpretation of this dream is that Jesus did not die on the cross, but that God saved him from the hands of his wicked enemies. As to our authority for this interpretation, we would refer the reader to the greatest writers on this point, who have had personal experience of what they incorporated afterwards in their books. For instance the author of تعطير الانام one of the most reliable works on interpretation says on this point:—

"If any one sees in a dream or in a vision that dead men have come out of their graves and gone back to their homes, the interpretation of the dream is that a prisoner will be set at liberty and be delivered from the hands of his oppressors," (see *Ta'tir ul anam fi Ta'bir il Manam* by Sheikh Abdul Ghani al Nabilasi, page 289).

From what the author has written, it appears that the prisoner referred to in the interpretation must be a great and illustrious personage. This interpretation is clearly applicable to the case of Jesus Christ, and we can easily understand that the rising of the dead saints and their visiting the city denoted nothing more. It was a sign for the wise to understand that Jesus escaped with his life from the cross.

Lastly, it is necessary to draw the reader's attention to another Biblical evidence met with in the following words of Matthew: "Verily I say unto you, 'There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.'" (Matt. 16: 28) and the words of John: "Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee" (John 21: 22). These verses clearly show that Jesus had made a promise with his disciples that his coming would be so speedy that some of the men of that time (John amongst them) would be still living. It was necessary that the prophetic words should have been fulfilled. The

Christians hold the same view and admit that Jesus had appeared, in accordance with his promise, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was seen by John who was then living. But they say that he had not descended from the heavens in full glory and with all the signs as he had predicted, but had only appeared in a revelation to John in order to fulfil his words preserved in Matt. 16: 28. But to take this strange explanation for a fulfilment of the prophecy is a mere stretch on the meaning of the words. This interpretation is forced out of the words in order to avoid the objections and is so plainly wrong that there hardly seems to be any need of refuting it. It appears rather ridiculous that Jesus should have made a prophecy in such forcible words, if its fulfilment had simply to consist in his being seen by some body in a dream or revelation,* for in this way he had long before appeared to St. Paul. The prophecy contained in Matt. 16: 28, has perplexed the minds of the Christians who have not been able to construe these words in any reasonable sense in conformity with their religious views. They cannot assert that Jesus had appeared in his glory at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, nor can they overlook the words wherein Jesus had plainly told them that some of those who were standing before him should not pass away till they had seen the son of man coming in his kingdom. They are, therefore, obliged to strain the words into quite a different sense, and take them as indicating the appearance of Jesus in a spiritual sense. But this is a gross mistake. The elect of God even after death often appear to good men in their visions, not necessarily in dreams but sometimes also in a state of wakefulness. Such scenes often present themselves, and we are fully aware that we are in this world, seeing with our eyes, hearing with our ears and speaking with our tongues, but on a deeper consideration it appears that at such times we are in a supernatural world. The people of the world do not know such wakefulness, for they lead lives of indifference and negligence. Such wakefulness is granted from heaven to those

* The meaning attached by some Muslim Maulvis to the words of Matt. 16: 28, is still more amusing. They maintain that since Jesus had made it a condition of his second advent that some persons of that time (John amongst them) should be still living, therefore, since Christ has not yet appeared, it follows that John is still alive hidden in some mountain where he is waiting for the Messiah.

who are endowed with other senses besides those possessed by ordinary people. This is a fact and a substantial reality. If, therefore, John had seen Jesus in this manner at the time of the desolation of Jerusalem, this event has no connection with the prophecy contained in Matt. 16 : 28, and does not in any way constitute the fulfilment thereof, even though John might have in that state conversed with his master. One may still see Jesus or any other of God's chosen prophets in that way provided the grace of God be with him.

The real nature of the prophecy is, therefore, simply this that Jesus sincerely believed that he would be saved from the death on the cross, and would not depart from this world before he had seen the ruin of the Jews with his own eyes, and before the heavenly kingdom shone in its full glory upon earth. Jesus knew it full well that God would never destroy him and his mission but that ultimately success would crown his efforts. He uttered the prophecy for the consolation of his disciples to whom he meant to convey in these words that those who had taken up the sword against him would perish with the sword in his life and before his eyes. What stronger proof can be given to a Christian than the words uttered by Jesus that some of the people of his time would be living when he would come again.

The reader should notice that the Gospels contain two sorts of prophecies regarding the second advent of Jesus. (1) Prophecies which foretell of his appearance in the last ages. It should be carefully borne in mind that a spiritual and not a corporeal appearance is meant here. Christ would surely come but exactly in the same manner as Elias had come. (Matt. 17 : 12, 13; and Mark. 9 : 13). As in the case of the prophecy about the coming of Elias, we should take John the Baptist for the promised one, so the promise of the second advent of Christ had to be fulfilled by the appearance of a person in the spirit and power of Christ. Thus the prophecy has been fulfilled in the person of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who is the Promised Messiah. He has been raised for the good of mankind, and on account of his spiritual resemblance with Christ, he appears under the name of the Promised Messiah, the glad tidings of whose advent are given by Jesus so often in the Gospels. Blessed are they who out of respect for the word of Jesus free themselves from all prejudices in considering this point and do not stumble. (2) All other prophecies which

speak of the re-appearance of Jesus are, in fact, meant to corroborate the statement that Jesus escaped with his life from the cross and lived to preach the word to his people. The Christians have committed a gross mistake in confusing these two kinds of prophecies. Consequently, they find themselves involved in serious difficulties on these points, which they could have easily avoided by drawing a line of demarcation as shown above.

Notes and Comments.

The Higher Criticism and the Christian Missionaries.

Anent a lecture given by Dr. Rouse in Calcutta at the Bengali Christian Conference on "The Higher Criticism of the Bible," the Harvest Field, a Missionary Magazine, writes :—

"We believe that it is very desirable in the interests of truth and of the Christian Church in India that more attention should be paid to the doctrine of inspiration as the majority of the leaders and scholars of the Christian Church now formulate it..... For our part we would repeat the wise words of the *Indian Witness*. 'For a long time we have feel that it is unwise and unfair to the Indian Church, especially to the educated young men rapidly coming to the front, to withhold knowledge of the mighty revolution in Biblical criticism now proceeding in the west. There is sure to be a rude and injurious awakening on the subject if anything like a conspiracy of silence should be observed. The vast majority of the Indian Ministers are wholly ignorant of the new views of the Bible entertained by the bulk of the Missionaries. As one of the speakers at the conference affirmed, there are young men in training for the ministry at the present time who are still being taught the doctrine of verbal inspiration and the absolute inerrancy of the text of scripture. To teach this is to play into the hands of the enemy in a sadly unwise manner, and is little less than high treason against truth.....Senseless denunciation of higher criticism and contemptuous references to the critics are unworthy of Christian truth-seekers and should cease.'"

Thus has the Bible been swept away like a straw before the

mighty current of modern criticism and such was the fate it deserved. It is not the unmixed Word of God, it is not unerring, such is the modern Christian faith, and we are glad to see that even the Christian Missionaries have recognised the truth of these views. But in spite of this belief it is nothing less than sheer folly to depend on it for salvation. What is not itself free from error, cannot free others. Nineteen hundred years' experience further bears testimony to the failure of the Bible as a purifying agency. But if the Bible is erroneous in certain parts, while other parts of it contain some truth, what test do the Christians have in their hands for distinguishing truth from error? If it is reason, then the Christian faith must openly avow itself to be based on Reason and not on Revelation. But if this test is revelation, surely some pure and trustworthy revelation free from error is required to sift the truth from the falsehood contained in the Bible. This revelation is found in the Holy Quran, for it is the only Book on the face of the earth which claims to be the true and unmixed Word of God, free from every error and every fault. It is the Holy Quran which first declared that the Bible did not contain the unmixed Word of God, and hence its own necessity as the pure Divine word. We are glad to see that the view which the Holy Quran took of the Bible has at last been admitted by even the Missionaries. But we are unable to account for the misguided zeal with which they are still preaching this book which even according to them is not free from error. Do they think that they can do any good to the world by preaching error? The truth of the higher criticism and the error of the Bible being once recognised, it is difficult to see how the Christian religion can stand for a moment? The most trustworthy book containing the views of higher critics and written by professed Christians is the Encyclopædia Biblica in which it is stated in column 1881 (Vol. II) that in all the Gospels there are only five absolutely credible passages about Jesus. These are enumerated as follows :—1 "Why callest thou me good? none is good save God only." (Mark. 10: 17). 2. The statement in Matt. 12: 31 that blasphemy against the son of man can be forgiven. 3. The statement in Mark. 3: 21, that his relatives held him to be beside himself. 4. Mark. 13: 32, "Of that day and of that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the son, but the Father." 5. Mark. 15: 34, and Matt. 27: 46, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.'

Professor Schmiedel, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Zurich, (for the author of these remarks is no less a church dignitary that he) then goes on to say that these passages which "might be called the foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus" conclusively prove "that in the person of Jesus we have to do with a completely human being, and that the divine is to be sought in him only in the form in which it is capable of being found in a man." We hope that the Christian Missionaries will plainly avow these truths and condemn the false belief of the Divinity of Jesus.

Ruhulla.

A correspondent signing himself "a Hindu Reader" writes to the Epiphany of April 18th, 1903, that "in the Alkoran of the Muhammadans" the four prophets Moses, Abraham, Christ and Muhammad "are mentioned with particular titles after their names," *viz.*, "Kalimullah, Khalilullah, Ruhullah and Habibullah" respectively, and the editor seems to hold the same opinion as he publishes the letter without any comment. Such gross ignorance of the Holy Quran, the sacred book of the Muhammadans, is very much to be regretted especially when it is considered that publicity is given to these very views in widely circulated papers. As a matter of fact not a single one of these epithets is used in the Holy Quran after the name of any of the prophets named or any other prophet at all. Speaking of the birth of Jesus, the Holy Quarn, no doubt, uses the words روح منه *i.e.*, "a soul from God," but that is quite a different thing. The words are really meant to declare the purity of the birth of Jesus and to condemn his alleged illegitimacy. The birth of Jesus had been the object of the most serious charge of illegitimacy and it was, therefore, necessary for the Holy Quran to refute this charge before requiring its followers to believe in him as a righteous prophet of God. A soul that was born in contravention of the Divine law of marriage, *i.e.*, an issue of fornication, would be described metaphorically as a devilish soul or the son of devil. This was exactly what the Jews alleged of Jesus and it was to refute this scandalous attack that the Holy Quran described Jesus as a soul from God, and thus refuted the Jewish allegation of the soul of Jesus being a Devilish soul or the offspring of fornication. Elsewhere the Holy Quran has described impure souls as devilish souls. The reason

why similar words have not been used of any other prophet of God is now apparent. There has been no prophet of God whose birth has been made the object of the scandalous charge of illegitimacy like Jesus, and hence there was no necessity of describing their souls as souls from God, because they were not affirmed to be devilish by their enemies. It is thus clear that the description of Jesus as a soul from God is meant only to refute the charge of illegitimacy. Every word of the Holy Quran has been revealed to satisfy a need and the words "a soul from God" as descriptive of Jesus are meant to establish the purity of his birth, and thus he has been placed by the Quran on the same level as other prophets in this respect though his enemies would not have it so. In fact, if God had declared in the case of other prophets as He has done in the case of Jesus, that they were not of illegitimate birth, it would have been a kind of insult to them, so it is foolish to think that Jesus was superior to other prophets because he is cleared of the charge of illegitimate birth and others are not. The word صدیقہ used of Mary has the same object in view. By describing her as a righteous and chaste woman, the Holy Quran does not mean to assert that there have been no other righteous or chaste women. Her chastity was questioned as was the legitimacy of her son's birth and, therefore, it was necessary to establish it and refute the false charge of adultery brought against her by the Jews. Similar is the import of the tradition which describes Mary and her son as free from the touch of Satan. The Jews attributed Satanic works and attributes to both mother and son and, therefore, it was necessary for the Holy Prophet to declare them as having no connection with Satan. The tradition in no way refers to their sinlessness but simply clears them of the false charges brought against them by the Jews.

Increase of Muhammadans in India in the last decade.

The Census Report of 1901 shows that with a very small missionary and propagandic effort, Islam shows an increase in India which far exceeds the increases boasted by all the other religions of the country taken together. The following figures illustrate this remark. Since 1891 the Hindus have decreased by 585,000, the Christians have increased by about 639,000, the Buddhists by a little over 2,845,000, and the Sikhs by 187,400. Thus the

total increase for all religions in British India for the decade ending with 1901 is only about 2,586,400, while during the same period the Muhammadans have added more than 5,000,000 souls to their numbers, which is about double the increase of all other religions taken together. Out of a total population of 294 millions, the Muhammadans are 62½ millions, *i.e.*, only about 21 per cent. of the whole population. This marvellous progress of the religion of Islam in spite of many disadvantages and the paucity of the means of propagation at its disposal is due solely to its simple and attractive principles. Still it is a matter of great regret that of the 639,000 added to Christianity, though the greater number is due to conversion from other faiths yet not a few are converted from Islam. This is the result of owning principles in contravention of the Holy Quran which make the access of Christianity into ignorant hearts very easy. Is it not true that when the pure principles of Islam were preached hundreds of thousands of Christians renounced their religion for the sake of Islam, whereas now some ignorant Muhammadans have deserted their faith for a false system.

The Tomb of Jesus.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me to say a few words with reference to an anonymous letter appearing in the *Epiphany* dated 11th April 1903. The writer speaks of the tomb of a prophet at Srinagar to which he seems to have paid a visit. He makes an attempt to contradict some of the facts published by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian regarding the tomb.

The writer mostly accepts the facts published by the Mirza Sahib, and where he disagrees, he offers no reason for his disagreement. He admits that the tomb is known as that of a Prophet or a *Nabi*, and that one of the names by which the occupant of the tomb is known is Yus Asaf. Admitting both these facts, he is of opinion that the person who is known as Yus Asaf was a Muhammadan Saint of Cashmere who died not more than 200 years ago. This conclusion of his is merely based on the style and form of

the building. He remarks, "To judge by its materials and its style, the building might possibly be 200 years old, but probably it is a good deal more recent." Even if we suppose that the building is not more than 200 years old, can we conclude from it that Yus Asaf lived not more than 200 years since? Does he not know that old buildings are often repaired, and when an ancient building is brought to ruins by the wasting influence of the rolling years, new buildings have to be erected instead? The fact that he is known as a Prophet or *Nabi* refutes the idea of his being a Muhammadan Saint. No intelligent man would think that a person who was reputed as a prophet among the Muhammadans was a Muhammadan Saint. Even if a Muhammadan Saint work miracles, they would take him as a *Wali* at the best and never as a prophet. They believe that their Holy Prophet is the seal of the prophets and that he is not to be followed by any other prophet. Hence the fact that Yus Asaf is believed to be a prophet by the Muhammadans of Cashmere, clearly shows that he lived prior to the time of the Holy Prophet of Arabia صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم and one who takes him for a Muhammadan Saint only, betrays his complete ignorance of the beliefs prevailing among the Muhammadans. The conclusion at which the writer of the letter has arrived, *viz.*, that Yus Asaf was a Muhammadan Saint who lived not more than 200 years ago, is contradicted by the evidence contained in his own letter.

Firstly, he states that the people of the place regarded him as one of the 1,24,000 'prophets of Islam.' This evidence shows that Yus Asaf lived before the time of the Holy Prophet, for the 1,24,000 prophets of whom he is believed to be one, all preceded the Holy Prophet of Islam and none of them appeared after him.

Secondly, the very fact that he is reputed as a prophet among the Muhammadans shows, as has already been explained, that he appeared before the time of the Holy Prophet of Arabia صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم. We do not know of any prophet who appeared in Cashmere within the last 200 years.

Thirdly, the writer informs us that the tomb is known as that of *Yus Asaf*. This evidence again shows that he is a prophet of old days and not of any recent times. It is this *Yus Asaf* that is

known to Europe as St. Joasaph or St. Josaphat. The story of Joasaph was first introduced into Europe by means of a Greek work written in the 8th century by St. John of Damascas. Some versions of the story were written much earlier. Yus Asaf or Joasaph was cannonised as a Saint and has a church dedicated to his name at Plermo. The reason why he was cannonised as a saint is that his teachings and parables bore a close resemblance to and some of them were even identical with those of Jesus. Some Christian writers have on account of this close resemblance thought him to be a disciple of Jesus. Some versions of the story of St. Joasaph clearly state that he died in Cashmere. Now there are very old versions of the story and there is every reason to believe that Yus Asaf of Cashmere lived not later than in the first century. This carries us as far back as Jesus himself. There may be much of fiction mingled in the stories of Joasaph or Yus Asaf, but they certainly refute the assumption that Yus Asaf was a Muhammadan Saint and that he lived not more than 200 years ago.

The writer of the letter is bold enough to charge Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian with fabrication. The Mirza Sahib has published certain facts regarding the tomb which prove the tomb to be the sepulchre of Jesus Christ. The Mirza Sahib has announced that the tomb at Srinagar is known among the people as that of Yus Asaf (also Isa Sahib) who was a prophet, prince and foreigner, and had come from the west about 1900 years ago. Some of these facts the writer admits, but the rest he calls pure fiction. This gentleman seems to have made a very poor inquiry there. His inquiry was limited only to a few persons that happened to be there. If he wanted to contradict the statements published by the Mirza Sahib throughout the world, he ought to have conducted his investigations on a larger scale and devoted a greater amount of time to this important investigation. The truth is that this gentleman, who, to all appearance, is a native Christian, and Punjabi, did not wish to push his inquiries much further, lest the truth should be revealed to him. He contented himself with a few vague answers which he received from those that chanced to be present there. If he had extended his inquiries to a wider range, he would have certainly come across many persons who would have given

him all the information that is to be found in the writings of the Mirza Sahib. Let me inform him that the announcement of the Mirza Sahib is not based on such meagre investigation as his. He, on the other hand, sent some persons to Srinagar with the express purpose of making inquiries about the tomb. These men, who were well educated and knew the Kashmiri language, lived there for months and patiently carried on their investigation regarding the tomb. Besides numerous oral testimonies of illiterate persons, they procured the signatures and written testimonies of abont 500 of the leading and learned men unanimously attesting all the points which he subsequently published for the information of the public. Compared with his mature investigation; the hasty and partial investigation of a native Christian who has not the moral courage even to make his name known to the public, may be well set at naught. The truth is that all the positive information which this nameless gentleman has gathered quite agrees with the facts published by the Mirza Sahib. The only difference is that the latter has gathered more facts and taken more pains than the former. Nothing can surpass the audacity of this obscure gentleman in accusing the Mirza Sahib of forgery and fabrication. The people to whom he addressed his inquiries did tell him that the tomb was known as that of prophet Yus Asaf—a statement which quite agrees with the facts published by the Mirza Sahib, but still this writer has the stupidity to charge the Mirza Sahib with grave fabrication. He did not hear them denying the facts which the Mirza Sahib has published regarding the tomb. On the other hand, there is much in their evidence which testifies to the truth of all the statements of the Mirza Sahib. Though they did not tell him that he was a prince that had come from a country in the west about 1900 years ago—which perhaps they would have told him if he had put them direct questions on these points—yet all these facts can be inferred from their statements. There is a good deal in their evidence from which we can surely conclude that he was a prince that had come to this land from a western country and that he was an Israelite prophet, and in fact we can conclude all the facts which the Mirza Sahib has published from their evidence.

The name Yus Asaf is an evidence of his being a prince. This

name occurs in many old writings where he is invariably spoken of as a prince. So though they did not expressly state that he was called a prince yet the very fact that they called him by the name Yus Asaf leads us to the conclusion that he was a prince. That he was a foreigner is evident from the following considerations:—

1. Yus Asaf is not an Indian name, so the person who bore the name must have been a foreigner.

2. The fact that he is known as a prophet or *nabi* also shows that he was not a native of India, for in that case he must have been known as an *avatar* or a Buddha. The word *nabi* shows that he was an Israelite prophet, for that name is applied to none but the Semitic prophets.

Thus ws see that there is not a bit in the statements of the individuals of whom he enquired about the tomb, which clashes with the statement published by the Mirza Sahib. On the other hand, their statements quite agree with and lend support to the facts published by the Mirza Sahib, and the conduct of this unknown writer in attributing false charges to the Mirza Sahib deserves to be condemned. He heads his article with the words 'The truth about the tomb of Yus Asaf,' but we are surprised to find that his letter reveals no new truth. All the facts which he relates are exactly those related by the Mirza Sahib. He expresses his opinion that this Yus Asaf was a Muhammadan Saint who lived not more than 200 years ago. We are not concerned with his private opinion, the facts he relates lend not the least support to his views. On the other hand, they contradict his opinion and if he has drawn his conclusion from the facts he relates in his letter, then we must be compelled to say that a human mind never drew a more absurd and unnatural conclusion. The pamphlet issued by the Mirza Sahib regarding the tomb contained a reference to an old stone with an effaced and almost illegible inscription. The writer has something to say about this stone. He denies its existence altogether and cites it as an instance of fabrication by the Mirza Sahib. Poor fellow, he in vain took the trouble of going to Srinagar. He returned with a very imperfect information and puffed up with the little information in his head, he thought himself in a position to refute

the announcements of the Mirza Sahib. If he had made a thorough investigation, he would not have appeared with his letter in the columns of the *Epiphany*. It appears that he cast a silent look all about the tomb and finding no inscription there, he declared that no such stone existed at all and that the Mirza Sahib had been guilty of a serious fabrication. If he had made as thorough an investigation as the Mirza Sahib has done, he would have learnt that the stone of which the Mirza Sahib speaks lies in a fortified place on the top of a hill known as Kuh-i-Sulaiman at the distance of about a mile from the tomb. If he desired to find some inscription lying in or near the tomb, he ought to have caused the tomb to be dug up and then, probably, he would have found some kind of inscription which would have assured him that the body that lies buried in the tomb, is of one whom he worships as his God.

He states that the tomb is generally known as Ranga Sahib. It is not at all known by such a name as that. This seems to be a misprint for *Rauza*. The place is known as *Rauza bal*. *Rauza* is a common name generally given to *Shrines* and other sacred places. *Bal*, in Cashmiri, means a place frequented by the people. The word *bal* occurs in combination with several other names, *e. g.*, *yar bal*, *tar bal*, *maha bal*, all of which are the names of places. So the *rauza bal*, being merely the name of the place, does not interfere with the position held by the Mirza Sahib. By the by, I hope the writer would do well to have the misprint corrected in some issue of the *Epiphany* for this error is likely to mislead the readers.

The writer of the letter is simple enough to call the death of Jesus on the cross a historical fact. If Jesus died on the cross, why did the blood gush forth when his side was piecered with a lance. How could merely three hours' suspension on the cross kill him? The two men that were hung up along with Jesus came down quite alive and perfectly conscious. Jesus left his tomb, travelled on foot for miles, ate and drank with his disciples, and as the books on medicine inform us, had his wounds cured by the use of an ointment, known as the Ointment of Apostles. Does not all this show that the three hours' suspension had not killed him, and that his prophecy of showing a sign like that of Jonah was fulfilled? Jonah went into the belly of the *whale* alive and came out *alive*, and

an exactly similar event occured in the case of Jesus. But in spite of all this, the writer thinks that the death of Jesus on the cross is an historical event. Does he not know that the fact that Jesus was in a state of a swoon and was mistaken for dead, is known from the earliest days of Christianity ?

The writer makes a sneering reference to the ointment known as the Ointment of the Apostles and also as the Ointment of Jesus. This ointment is mentioned in a very large number of works on medicine, wherein the writers speak of it as an ointment prepared by the Apostles for the wounds of Jesus. Very old works speak of it. It is also found in Latin and Greek works, and is in Latin known as Unguentum Apostolorum. The Christian gentleman must know that simply jeering and sneering at the ointment would not do. It is found in very old works and is an incontrovertible evidence of the escape of Jesus from the accursed death of the cross. The authority of the medical works is irrefutable. Jesus left his country and came to the lost tribes of Israel that had settled in Afghanistan and Cashmere, and the tomb of a Prince Prophet and foreigner at Srinagar, marks the goal of Jesus' career on earth. One that was born at Bethleham in Syria lies entombed at Khan Yar in Srinagar.

After I had written the foregoing lines, I chanced to see an ably written article on Cashmere in the April number of Al-Hilal, a Christian Magazine issued from Beyrout. The Editor speaks of the tomb in the following words :—

وفى حارة تسمى الخانيار فى هذه المدينة قبر يسميه القشا مرا قبر النبى يوزآسف يزدره العوام والخواص وفى بعض كتب التاريخ عندهم ان يوزآسف هذا كان نبياً من الانبياء جاء من اقصى البلاد ومات ودفن فى هذه المدينة فزعم رجل فنجابى ان هذا النبى هو المسيح

"In the Khan Yar Street of this city (Srinagar) there is a tomb, which the people of Cashmere call the tomb of Prophet Yus Asaf. It is visited by people of all classes. Some of the histories of the country state that this Yus Asaf was a Prophet, who came from a distant country. He died and was buried in this city. A

gentleman of the Punjab thinks that this Prophet was Jesus." This testimony coming from the pen of a learned Christian Editor, alone suffices to refute the novel theory that Yus Asaf was a Muhammadan Saint who lived not more than 200 years ago. They also show that the tomb is not so unknown as the unknown writer in the *Epiphany* represents it to be.

QADIAN, *1st May 1903.* SHER ALI.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] JUNE, 1903. No. 6.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

*The Sources of Divine Knowledge.

Having regard to the scope of the limited time allowed to me in this gathering and to the comprehensiveness with which the Holy Quran has treated this subject, I shall make myself as brief as possible. The Holy Quran has described three degrees of knowledge as already shown in commenting upon the *Sura Takasur*, *viz.*, علم اليقين or obtaining the knowledge of certainty with respect to a thing, عين اليقين or seeing it with the eye of certainty, and حق اليقين or realizing the truth of its certainty. Of these, the علم اليقين is the knowledge of a thing acquired inferentially as we conclude the existence of fire from the presence of smoke in a place without witnessing fire itself. But if we see the fire itself, our knowledge of the existence of fire is a knowledge of the second degree, *viz.*, عين اليقين. Our knowledge of a thing which we witness with the eye of certainty, may however be further improved upon by bringing it home to our own experience, for instance by thrusting our hand into the fire in the above case. Then we reach the highest stage of certainty which, in the language of the Holy Quran, is حق اليقين. The *sura* which describes these three stages of knowledge has already been quoted and commented upon in answer to Question II.

* This paper was read before the great Religious Conference held at Lahore in December 1896, having been written by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Chief of Qadian, the Promised Messiah. It forms the answer to the 5th question, the answers to the first four questions having appeared in the last year's volume.

The sources which give rise to a knowledge of certainty are reason and information. With reference to those whose abode shall be hell, the Holy Quran says: وقالوا لو كنا نسمع او نعقل ما كنا في اصحاب السعير (الملك) "And they shall say, Had we but listened to the discourses of the wise or been ourselves wise and tested religion and belief by reason, we should not have been among the dwellers of hell." The same purport is elsewhere expressed in the Holy Quran in the words: لا يكلف الله نفسا الا وسعها "God does not compel any soul to accept that which is beyond its capacity." In this verse Almighty God gives us clearly to understand that the doctrines and beliefs to which He invites people through His messengers, are only such as are within the capacity of human understanding and knowledge, and He does not force them to bear any burden which is beyond their strength. The verses quoted above also point to the fact that a person can acquire the knowledge of certainty through accurate information. We have, for instance, not seen London, but still we are certain of the existence of a town of this name, because we cannot disbelieve all those who have seen it. Or, although we did not live in the time of Aurangzeb nor did we ever see him, still it is beyond the shadow of a doubt that Aurangzeb was one of the Moghul Emperors who reigned in India. We can, thus, arrive at a certain conclusion as to the reality of a fact or the existence of a thing through hearing when the testimony is unbroken. The inspirations of the prophets are a source of knowledge provided that there has been no interruption in their transmission, and the vehicle which conveys them is not of an imperfect nature. But if there are fifty or seventy different accounts of a single narrative contradicting each other, and the documents containing them all pretend to be based on revelation, the mere acceptance by any sect of some of these documents as of a heavenly origin and the condemnation of the rest as spurious and fabricated if not based on a critical enquiry, does not lead to a certain knowledge of the truth of the facts therein related. A series of such narratives inconsistent with each other is utterly incredible and we need no other proof for their condemnation as mere waste. Nor can they when wanting in consistency, the great test of the truth of a fact, be the source of knowledge because they

cannot give rise to any certain conclusion, being themselves coloured in dubiety.

In connection with these remarks it should be borne in mind that the truth of the Holy Quran does not depend simply on its uninterrupted transmission and authenticity, because it proceeds on the argumentative line. It does not compel us to accept its doctrines, principles and commandments simply on the authority of revelation but appeals to reason in man and gives arguments for what it inculcates. It is to this fact that the Holy Quran alludes when it says that the principles which it inculcates are impressed in the nature of man as we have in the verse: هذا ذكر مبارك *i.e.*, this blessed book does not preach strange and novel doctrines but it is a rememberance of that which is impressed in the nature of man and the laws of nature. It also says: لا اكراه في الدين "In this faith, *i.e.*, the faith of Islam, there is no compulsion," *i.e.*, it does not compel a man to accept its doctrines but offers reasons for their acceptance. Besides, the Holy Quran has the spiritual property of giving a light to the hearts as it says: شفاء لما في الصدور *i.e.*, "the Holy Quran is a cure for all spiritual ailments." The Holy Quran is, therefore, not a book which derives all its force from being an ancient document which has been handed down to us through a safe course of transmission, but its real force lies in the sound arguments which it produces and the clear light which it sheds.

In like manner, intellectual arguments which have a sound basis, lead a man to a knowledge of certainty. To this the Holy Quran alludes in the following verses: ان في خلق السموات والارض واختلاف الليل والنهار لايات لاولي الالباب الذين يذكرون الله قياما وقعودا وعلى جنوبهم ويتفكرون في خلق السموات والارض ربنا ما خلقت هذا باطلا سبحنك فقنا عذاب النار (آل عمران) *i.e.*, "When men of wisdom and understanding reflect upon the creation of the earth and the heavenly bodies, and look deeply into the causes which bring about variation in day and night, they find therein clear arguments of the existence of God. For a clearer understanding and knowledge they seek the assistance of God, and remember Him in all postures whether standing, sitting or reclining. This

brightens their understandings the more, so when they muse on the consummate creation of the heavens and the earth, they arrive at the certain conclusion that the perfect order and all-wise plan discernable in all these glorious orbs is not in vain, but reveals the bright face of its Creator. Thus being brought to a knowledge of the Creator, they sing hymns of praise to Him saying "O our Lord! Glory be to Thee, and far be it from Thee that any one should deny Thy existence or impute to Thee unworthy attributes. Save us Thou from hell-fire, for Thy denial is a hell and true happiness and felicity lies only in Thee and Thy knowledge. The person who has failed to recognise Thee, is truly in hell-fire in this very world,"

Conscience which in the Holy Word of God is called human nature, is also a source of knowledge. Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: فطرة الله التي فطر الناس عليها (الروم) "The Divine impression on the nature of men with which all men have been created." This impression in the nature of man makes him regard Almighty God as one without any partner, the Creator of every thing, and free from subjection to death and birth. Although the knowledge derived from human nature does not appear to be inferential, yet we have called the human nature a source of knowledge because it leads to a conclusion by a very fine thread of inference. Almighty God has charged every thing with a peculiar property which it is difficult to describe in definite words, but when we imagine it and reflect over it, the inherent property at once strikes the idea. If, for instance, we imagine the person of the Divine Being and ponder over the attributes which we desire to place in Him, and consider whether He should undergo the process of birth and death and suffering like ourselves, the idea makes us shudder, and human nature revolts at it and recoils from it being unable to bear it, and repels the idea. The still small voice within us at once speaks out that the God in whose powers we must completely trust, must be a perfect and Almighty Being free from every blemish and defect. The idea of God and of the Unity of God co-exist in human nature and the one is not separable from the other. It is for this reason that I have described conscience or more properly human nature as a source of knowledge.

But we can attain to a higher degree of certainty than that which has been described above, through عين ا ليقين which means a direct knowledge of a thing, as far instance in the material world we obtain the knowledge of a scent through the sense of smell, that of sapidity through the muscles of taste and that of tangibility through the organs of touch. All these experiences fall under the heading of عين ا ليقين. But with respect to the life to come, our knowledge attains this degree when we are directly inspired by God, hear His sweet voice and see His glorious revelations. There is no doubt that we cannot attain to a perfect knowledge of God except through inspiration. Moreover we feel this desire, this thirst for inspiration, in our hearts which is inexplicable unless we admit that Almighty God has beforehand provided the means of its satisfaction. Can we in the present life which is the only gauge of the next and a nursery of it, remain contented with a blind faith, based on tales and legends, regarding the existence of the true, perfect, all-powerful and living God, or be satisfied with the insufficient research of reason which has hitherto given to the world only an imperfect and deficient knowledge of the Divine Being? Do not the lovers of God desire it, heart and soul, that they should enjoy the bliss of speaking to their Beloved One? Can they who have lost everything for the sake of God and forsaken all their worldly interests, nay given their heart and soul for the sake of their Divine Master, be content to stand in a dim light never to see the brilliant face of that shining Sun of righteousness? Is it not true that the sweet words "I am" of the living God, give a better knowledge of His existence than all the reasoning of the philosophers, so much so that all their colossal literature proving the existence of God by the insufficient light of reason is nothing compared with these words? What light can be expected from the person who himself never comes out of darkness?

In short if Almighty God has willed to give a perfect knowledge of His ownself to the seekers after truth, He has not shut the doors of illumining them with His word and revelation. In this connection the Holy Quran teaches the following prayer to the seekers after truth, اهدنا الصراط المستقيم صراط الذين انعمت عليهم "O Lord, guide us in the path of perseverance, the path of those who have drawn

Thy favors and blessings." The blessings here referred to signify the heavenly blessings which a man receives directly from God such as inspiration, revelation, &c. Almighty God says in another place in the Holy Quran: ان الذين قالوا ربنا الله ثم استقاموا تتنزل عليهم الملئكة الا تخافوا ولا تحزنوا وابشروا بالجنة التى كنتم توعدون (حم سجدة) "Those who believe in the true God and then remain faithful and constant, the angels of God descend upon them and say: 'Fear ye not, neither be ye grieved but rejoice that for you is the paradise which had been promised to you.'" This verse plainly indicates that the righteous servants of God are inspired by God in fear and grief and angels are sent down for their consolation. So also in another verse Almighty God says: لهم البشرى في الحيوة الدنيا وفى الاخرة "Good tidings are granted to the lovers of God through His Word and inspiration in this life as well as in the next."

Before proceeding further it is necessary to remove a misconception regarding *Ilham* (inspiration). *Ilham* does not mean that an idea is infused into the mind of a person who sets himself to think about a thing. A mere poet is not inspired in the theological sense when brilliant ideas flash upon him as he sits down to make verses. In this case there is no distinction between good and bad. When the mental powers are applied to a subject, new ideas will flash upon the mind according to the genius of the thinker and without any regard to the good or bad nature of the subject. If the word *Ilham* is taken to mean the occurring on a particular occasion of new ideas, a thief or a dacoit or a murderer may as well be called Mulham (the inspired one of God) on account of the ingenious plans which are suggested to his mischiefmaking mind for the perpetration of evil deeds. Such a view of *Ilham* (inspiration) is held by men who are quite ignorant of the true God who with His word gives peace and consolation to hearts and knowledge of spiritual truths to those who are not aware of them. What is *Ilham* (inspiration) then? It is the living and powerful Word of God in which He speaks to or addresses one of His servants whom He has chosen or intends to chose from among all people. When such conversation or utterances run on continually in a regular method not being insufficient or fragmentary or enveloped

in the darkness of evil ideas, and have a heavenly bliss, wisdom and power in them, they are the Word of God with which He comforts His servant and reveals Himself to him. It is no doubt true that words are spoken sometimes to a man by way of trial and then they are not accompanied with the perfection and blessings necessary to a true inspiration. In this early stage a person is tried and he will either stumble on account of the weakness of flesh or having tasted of the sweet and life-giving fountain of inspiration, transform himself and make himself like those who are truly inspired. If he does not walk in true righteousness like the faithful servants of God, he is deprived of the favor and has nothing but vanity in his heart.

It should, moreover, be remembered that all those who receive inspiration are not of equal rank in the sight of God. Even the prophets whose inspiration stands far above the inspiration of others on account of its clearness, force and excellence, are not all upon the same level. As Almighty God says : تلک الرسل فضلنا بعضهم علی بعض "Some prophets have been exalted over others." From this it appears that inspiration is merely a grace of God, and does not interfere with the exaltation of degrees, for the latter depends upon the sincerity, devotion and faithfulness of a person towards God. Divine inspiration, if accompanied with all its requisites, is no doubt also a fruit of these qualities. If an answer comes to a man when he entreats his Divine Master, and there is no break or irregularity in the answers vouchsafed by the Divine Being to His servant, and the word is accompanied with Divine majesty and light and reveals the deep secrets of the future and hidden truths, there is no doubt that the word is Divine inspiration. It is necessary that between the recipient of such an inspiration and the Divine Being there should be a very close connection such as exists in conversation between two familiar friends. When he should address his prayers to Almighty God, an answer may be vouchsafed to him in sweet and elegant words, proceeding from the Divine Being, and not being the result of his own desires or of any deliberation or reflection on his part, and he should be continually graced with such words and answers. Then is surely the word which comes to him the Word of God and he has honor in the Divine presence.

But this gift of pure and living words revealed with clearness from God and not mixed with low desires, is not granted to any but those whose hearts are marked with a high degree of faith and sincerity and virtuous deeds and that which cannot be described in words. A true and pure inspiration reveals mighty wonders of Divinity. Very often an effulgent light is created and with it comes a bright and majestic inspiration. What greater blessing or happiness can be conceived of than speaking to the Creator of the earth and heavens and being spoken to by Him? In this world the face of God is revealed by His Word and, therefore, such a man enjoys the favor of His sight.

It should however be noticed that the mere utterance of words and phrases not distinctly recognised as having come from God, does not fall under the heading of Divine inspiration. A person who finds himself in this condition is really tried by God. For, Almighty God sometimes tries men who are remiss and negligent in the performance of their duties towards God by infusing certain words or phrases into their heart or causing them to be uttered from their lips with respect to which they are like blind men not knowing whether the words come from God or Satan. For a person who is thus tried by God, it is meet that he should repent and turn to God and reform himself. But the righteous man to whom the doors of Divine revelation are thrown wide open, and who is spoken to by God openly in words which have light, sweetness, majesty, deep significance and more than mortal wisdom in them, whose entreaties and supplications are answered by the Almighty as often as they are urged, who when perfectly awake has addressed his supplications to the Almighty repeatedly, say ten or twenty times, on a single occasion and received answers thereto, whose prayers are accepted hundreds of times, who has been informed of excellent truths, nice points and deep secrets of the future on numerous occasions by means of the inspiration which he receives,—the person upon whom these favors are showered, must be thankful to God and devote himself wholly to His path, for him He has chosen out of His rich grace and mercy and him He has made an heir to all the blessings which He granted to the righteous before. But this highest Divine favor is granted

seldom and to very few, and those to whom it is granted consider every other blessing as naught in comparison with this.

It is among the Muhammadans that individuals have always been raised to this spiritual eminence. Islam is in fact the only religion in which God approaches His servant and speaks to him and within him. He makes His habitation within his heart and draws him up to heaven. He grants him all the blessings which He granted to the righteous before him. Ah! the world is blind and does not know what a man may attain to if he comes nearer and nearer to God. The people of the world do not take a single step to attain the nearness of God, but him who is a pilgrim in this path, they either declare an heretic or worship as God. Both classes are guilty of an iniquity, the one for its excessive hatred and the other for its excessive love. But the wise man should adopt the mean course, neither rejecting him whom God has chosen for this eminence, nor bowing down before him whom God has created, as before the Creator Himself. The mantle of Divinity is cast upon the person who is thus favored by God and he becomes a looking-glass for the image of the Divine Being. This is the secret of the words spoken by the Holy Prophet "Whoever has seen me, has seen God." This is the final stage in the spiritual progress of a man, the goal where all his labors end and rest and satisfaction are granted to the pilgrim.

I shall be guilty of a great injustice if I hide the fact that I have been raised to this spiritual eminence. Almighty God has favored me with His certain word and chosen me that I may give sight to the blind, lead the seekers to the object of their search and give to the acceptors of truth the glad tidings of the pure fountain which is talked of among many but is found by very few. I assure the hearers that except by following the Holy Quran, no one can find the true God in whom lies the salvation of man and eternal bliss. It is my heart's inmost desire that others should see what I have seen and hear what I have heard, that they should forsake vain stories and run to accept the truth. That perfect source of knowledge which brings one to the noble presence of God, that pure heavenly water which washes off all doubts, that looking-glass through which the face of God is revealed,

is the Word of God, the Divine inspiration to which I have called attention. I say truly that if the soul desires it earnestly and the heart yearns after it, people should seek this way and set out in search of this path. But how can this way be opened and the veil of ignorance removed? I assure all seekers after truth that it is Islam only which promises this happy goal to the way-farer and gives the glad tidings of this path of salvation. With all other people the way is closed to Divine inspiration and to the followers of the Holy Prophet only it is open. But rest assured that Almighty God has not barred entrance to this way; such views are simply the invention of those who are themselves deprived of this heavenly blessing. Know it for certain also that as you cannot see without eyes, and hear without ears, and speak without tongue, in the same way you cannot see the face of the Beloved One without the Holy Quran. I was a young man and now I am old, but I have never seen a man who has drunk to satisfaction of the pure fountain of knowledge except from this source.

Bear in mind that no one can fight with God or frustrate His designs. Remember that the only means to a perfect Divine knowledge is the Divine inspiration, a blessing granted to the prophets of God. But Almighty God whose grace is bounteous has never willed that He should close the door to this Divine gift and thus destroy the world. The gates are still wide open through which a man can find entrance to the heavenly blessing of Divine inspiration and revelation. But to seek it walk in the proper path and then you will find it. That water of life came down from heaven and accumulated in a grand receptacle. To drink of it you must reach it, stumbling and falling, and apply your lips to the cold and refrigerant water of life. In this consists the felicity of man that he should run to the spot where any trace is given of the heavenly light and walk in the way in which he finds any trace of the friend whom he seeks. As light comes from heaven and sheds its lustre upon earth, the true light of guidance also comes from heaven. It is not through talk or conjectures that a man can attain to the source of true Divine knowledge. Are your eyes of any avail to you in total darkness? If they are, then may

your reason alone be a guide to a perfect knowledge of God. The true God is not the God whose lips are sealed and who is, thorefore, obliged to leave us to our own conjectures concerning Him. Nay, the perfect and living God has ever been giving unmistakable signs of His existence and He has even now willed to vouchsafe such signs to the present generation. The time is come when the doors of heaven shall be opened, and the dawn is about to break forth. Blessed are they who rise up and seek the true God, the God whom no adversity can overtake and no revolution of time can affect and whose lustre of glory never grows dim. He says in the Holy Quran: الله نور السموات والارض *i.e.*, "God is the light of heaven and the light of earth." It is from Him that all light proceeds. He is the sun of the sun and the life of all life, the true and living God. Blessed is he who accepts Him.

The third source of knowledge is that which is perfect in the highest degree and makes a man realize the truth of the certainty of Divine existence. These are the adversities and hardships which the prophets of God and the righteous are made to suffer from the hands of their enemies or a heavenly decree. Sufferings make a man realize the full force of the legal injunctions which are thus illustrated in his practical life. Religious dogmas are mere theories and their perfection consists in their practice. The person who undergoes great sufferings has an occasion to apply the treasures of knowledge which are accumulated in his heart, to actual circumstances of life and by their right application he becomes as it were a perfect embodiment of Divine guidance. The moral qualities of whose knowledge the brain and the heart are the sole depositaries at first, are displayed by actual practice in all the external and internal faculties, and forgiveness, revenge, patience, mercy, &c., are not more simple names to him but realities which he has felt and seen and which thus make an impression upon his external and internal nature. On this point Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: ولنبلونكم بشيء من الخوف والجوع ونقص من الاموال والانفس والثمرات وبشر الصبرين الذين اذا اصابتهم مصيبة قالوا انا لله وانا اليه راجعون اولئك عليهم صلوات من ربهم ورحمة واولئك هم المهتدون and again: لتبلون في اموالكم وانفسكم ولتسمعن من الذين اوتوا الكتب من قبلكم ومن الذين اشركوا اذى كثيرا وان

تصبروا وتتقوا فان ذلک من عزم الامور "With fear and hunger and loss of wealth and of lives and bringing to naught some of your efforts and causing loss of your children, We will prove you" *i.e.*, these mishaps will befall you either from the hands of your enemies or by a decree of heaven "but bear glad tidings to the patient who upon a mischance cry out: 'verily we are God's and verily to Him shall we return.' Upon these people are the blessings and mercy of God and these they are who are the truly guided." Here we are told that there is no very great excellence in the mere knowledge which is treasured in the heart or the brain, but the knowledge to be valued is that which on account of its application in the practical course of life gives a coloring to the whole of man. To strengthen and improve one's knowledge, the best means, therefore, is its application in practice so that its impression is left not only upon the brain but upon every faculty and limb. In fact every sort of knowledge, however low its comparative value, is defective so long as unattended by practice. It is to this point that in the verses quoted above Almighty God calls our attention. We are told that our morals are not actually formed unless they are proved by sufferings and trials which stand to them in the relation of practice to knowledge. The remaining portion of the verses above quoted may be thus translated: "You shall assuredly be tried in your properties and your souls, (*i.e.*, you shall be robbed of your properties and put to death), and many hurtful things shall you hear from the Jews, the Christians and the idolators, (*i.e.*, you shall suffer at their hands); but if you be patient and eschew improper words, this shall be a great and noble deed." All these verses show conclusively that knowledge is not perfect and fruitful without its practical application. Knowledge which is at its best in practice is a source of blessings, but that which never passes into the domain of the practical has no value.

The application of knowledge in practice is what makes a man attain the degree of حق ا لیقین in his knowledge, for the truth of the certainty of the knowledge of a thing cannot be realized unless every side of it is put to the practical test. This is what happened in Islam. Whatever injunctions were contained in the Holy Quran were beautifully illustrated in practice in the life of the Holy

Prophet and his companions who were thus enlightened with true light. For the fulfilment of this purpose Almighty God divided the life of our Holy Prophet into two distinct periods, the period of sufferings, adversities and persecutions, and the period of triumph and prosperity. This was done in order to give him an occasion for the display of both sorts of moral qualities, *viz.*, those which can be proved in time of sufferings and those which cannot be proved except in triumph and prosperity. In this way the Holy Prophet had all his moral qualities brought to the test of practice, and the two-fold condition of his life enabled him to display all the noble moral qualities in the highest degree. The thirteen years at Mecca represent the time of suffering, and a study of the circumstances of his life at that time shows clearly that there was not a single moral quality which could be manifested in the time of suffering by the righteous that was not displayed by the Holy Prophet. His complete trust in God, his refraining from showing the slightest impatience, his calm and serene mode, his noble and dignified manners, his unshaken activity and zeal in the performance of the duties entrusted to him, his perseverance, his fearlessness of his enemies and numerous other moral qualities so deeply impressed even the unbelievers that they bore testimony to the great miracle of his perseverance under the hardest trials and sufferings and were convinced that this was because of his whole trust in God. Then followed the life of the Prophet at Medina, a period of triumph, victory and prosperity, suited for the display of the second division of morals. His forgiveness of injuries, charity, courage and other such morals were so well displayed during this period that large numbers of the unbelievers became converts to Islam on seeing them. He freely forgave those who had persecuted and tortured him, gave shelter to those who had expelled him from Mecca, enriched the poor among them and forgave his bitterest foes when their lives were only at his mercy. The Divine morals thus displayed by the Holy Prophet convinced the Arabs that their possessor could not be but from God and a truly righteous man. Their inveterate hatred was by these noble morals at once converted into fast friendship.

One of these great and noble moral qualities is thus described

in the Holy Quran: قل ان صلوتی ونسکی ومحیای ومماتی للہ رب العلمین "Say to them: 'My prayers, and my sacrifice, and my life and my death are solely for God," *i.e.*, for the manifestation of the Divine glory, and for the welfare and benefit of mankind so that with his death a life may be granted to them. It should not be imagined that the death in the way of God and for the good of mankind here spoken of means that the prophet was under the delusion like ignorant and men run that a suicidal end of his own life would in any way benefit others. Nay, the Holy Prophet hated all such ideas and the Holy Quran regards the person who entertains such ideas as guilty of a serious crime and says in plain words: ولا تلقوا بایدیکم الی التھلکۃ *i.e.*, "Do not commit suicide and make not your own hands the instruments of your destruction." It is a plain truth that one man cannot relieve another of headache by breaking his own head. Such a step is at the best an act of foolishness. In short, the reference to the prophet's death in the way of God and for the benefit of mankind, simply denotes that the Holy Prophet had devoted his life out of sympathy for the welfare of mankind, and with his prayers and preaching and the adoption of every wise method for the regeneration of his people, as well as by bearing patiently their persecutions, he had sacrificed his life and all his comforts in this path. With reference to this sacrifice of his life, the Holy Quran elsewhere says: لعلک باخع نفسک الا یکونوا مومنین and again فلا تذھب نفسک علیھم حسرات *i.e.*, wilt thou wear thyself away with grief and hard work for these people who believe not, and wilt thou spend thy soul in sighs for these people who do not accept the truth? The way in which a man may sacrifice his life for his people is, therefore, to encounter all difficulties and work hard for their welfare by adopting measures which are likely to better their condition. It is mere folly to think that true sacrifice for a people who are deeply immersed in sin or involved in error, consists in committing suicide. To regard this act of folly as leading to the salvation of those who are gone astray is the height of absurdity. It betrays if not want of sense at least a weakness of character and the absence of moral courage. It is the faint-hearted man who seeks a shelter in death from the difficulties which he is unable to face. In

whatever way may that suicide be explained afterwards, it cannot be doubted that it is an act of folly combined with weakness of mind.

Now for a complete display of high morals a man must have been both in straitened and well-to-do circumstances. If he has always been persecuted and subjected only to sufferings and hardships, and has never had an occasion of wreaking his vengeance on his enemies, he cannot be said to possess the quality of forgiveness of injuries. What he would have done, had he the power to avenge himself on his enemies, is impossible to ascertain. To know, therefore, that a man possessed high moral qualities, it is not sufficient to know that he showed meekness and forbearance when he was powerless against his enemies and persecuted by them but also that he freely forgave those enemies when he was completely triumphant over them, and when they were solely at his mercy. If he never went into a field of battle, his courage shall be a moot point and we cannot say whether he would have shown martial daring or cowardice. If he has never seen affluence, it is difficult to say whether he would have amassed his riches or given them in charity if he had ever possessed them. But the grace of God granted the Holy Prophet suitable opportunities for the display of all sorts of morals such as meekness, charity, courage, forgiveness, justice, &c., in a highly excellent degree which is without a parallel in history.

It is true that forgiveness was not extended to the implacable foes of Islam who were bent upon its extirpation and who ruthlessly butchered innocent Muslims or put them to excruciating tortures and cruel persecutions. But pardon to them would have meant the annihilation of the righteous ones. The object of the wars undertaken by the Muslims at the bidding of the Prophet was not to cause bloodshed. They had been expelled from their homes to seek shelter elsewhere and many innocent Muslim men and women had been murdered in cold blood. But their relentless persecutors had not stopped there. In obedience to the Divine commandment of self-defence, the sword was allowed to be taken in hand against those who had taken up the sword for the utter extirpation of Islam. The object of these wars was, therefore,

to remedy an evil by abating the bloodshed caused by the persecutors of the Muslims. Had Islam not defended itself under these circumstances against the outrages of its persecutors, the result would have been the slaughter of hundreds of innocent lives including children and women and thus it would have been nipped in the bud.

The error of our opponents lies in a misconception of the attributes of the Divine Being. They think that a Divinely revealed Law should on no account and under no circumstances whatever enjoin a resistance of evil or the punishment of evil-doers, and that Divine love and mercy should not be manifested except in the form of meekness. With them the most reverential attitude towards the Divine Being consists in limiting His perfect attributes to humbleness and lowliness. This is a serious error. Anyone who can think for himself will easily see that the Divine laws of nature though they are a mercy for mankind are not always manifested in a mild and gentle form. The Divine physician out of His infinite mercy gives us sometimes the sweet sirup to drink and out of His mercy too administers the bitter dose on other occasions. Both are different manifestations of His mercy. Thus it is His mercy which requires that the wicked should be destroyed when He sees that they aim at the extirpation of the righteous and act corruptly in earth and shed innocent blood. For this purpose He sends punishment upon the wicked either from earth or from heaven for He is wise as He is merciful. Praise be to God who is the Lord of worlds.

Jesus among the Ten Lost Israelite Tribes in the East, IV.

EVIDENCES FROM THE QURAN AND THE TRADITIONS.

It may appear on a first sight that the arguments we are going to set forth under this heading cannot convince the Christian readers,

for they do not yield to the authority of the Quranic verses and the traditions. Our object, however, in putting them down here is to lay before the public the great miracle of the Holy Quran and our Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, that what has been discovered now was proclaimed by the Holy Quran and foretold by the Prophet so many centuries ago.

Almighty God says in the Holy Book :—

وما قتلوه يقينا and وما قتلوه وما صلبوه ولاكن شبه لهم "The Jews did not slay Jesus, nor did they put an end to his life on the cross, but they were simply in a doubt concerning him," *i.e.*, they imagined that Jesus had died on the cross, but they had no reason for resting assured that Jesus had really died on the cross.

It has been stated in these verses that though Jesus was fastened to the cross and his death had been determined upon, yet he did not actually die and the Jews were simply deceived by appearances in thinking that he had expired on the cross. It is remarkable how the solemn word of the Holy Quran set forth an opinion regarding the crucifixion of Jesus, which was diametrically opposed to the established doctrines of the Jews and the Christians, the two nations who as friends or foes had any interest in him. What a deep impression of the truth, the sublimity and the grandeur of the Holy Quran and of its divine origin, is left on our minds when we consider that the prophetic words of the Holy Quran, so far opposed to all that could be known through human researches and contradicting the views of the known world, have at last proved true and in exact accordance with the most thorough and close recent investigations to the utter discomfiture of the opposite doctrines. The question remains still unanswered, how did it happen that two or three hours' nailing to the cross brought the life of Jesus to an end without his bones being broken. This difficulty led some Jews to devise another story, *viz.*, that they had slain Jesus. Their ancient history, however, lends no support to this unfounded statement. The prevalence of darkness over the face of the earth, the earthquake, the dream of Pilate's wife, the approach of the Sabbath night when the criminals could

not be kept on the cross, and Pilate's desire to release Jesus on account of the frightening dream of his wife, all these circumstances acting at one and the same time, united to save the life of Jesus who was reduced to senselessness and appeared like a dead body. The awful signs of the darkness and the earthquake terrified the cowardly Jews of Divine punishment, and the approach of the night made them fearful lest they should incur the wrath of God by the profanation of the Sabbath. On the one hand they had apprehensions of danger to their families on account of the darkness and the earthquake, and, on the other, the appearance of these awful signs was quite inconsistent with their belief in the imposture and falsehood of Jesus. Confusion and shame made them lose all courage, and seeing Jesus in a state of swoon they mistook him for a dead body. In the disorder that followed they were so perplexed that they could not apply their minds to the most important of all questions, and went away in haste without satisfying themselves as to his death. This state of things had, however, been brought about by God to save His chosen prophet, and it is to this that the verse ولكن شبه لهم quoted above refers. Jesus was not dead and the Jews were themselves in doubt as to his death on the cross. Thus does God always help His servants in time of affliction and thus does their trust in Him grow stoanger.

Another verse of the Holy Quran regarding Christ runs thus: وجيها فى الدنيا والاخرة ومن المقربين "Distinguished in this world and in the next, and one of those who have near access to God," *i.e.*, he will attain to dignity, honor and eminence in this world and in the next. It is clear that Jesus did not attain to any worldly dignity in his native land. He was, on the other hand, always affronted and insulted. The idea that he will get to this honor and eminence on his second advent in this world, is an idle fancy, not only opposed to the Holy Books of God, but also incompatible with the laws of nature. The truth is that when on his deliverance from the hands of the wicked people of Judea Jesus fled to Cashmere and honored that country with his noble presence, he achieved temporal dignity there among the ten lost tribes of Israel. The preaching of Jesus took them by the hand and raised them up from their low spiritual state. And further as the teachings

of Jesus contained a bequest to accept the mission of the Prophet that was to come after him, the ten tribes of Israel, generally known under the names of Afghans and Kashmiris, eventually became Muslims. In fine, Jesus obtained great worldly honor in the eastern countries. There is also a verse in the Holy Quran in which Jesus has been made to say: وجعلنی مبارکا اینما کنت * "And He hath made me blessed wherever I am."

Similarly we read in the Holy Quran: من الذین کفروا *i.e.*, "And I will show thy (referring to Jesus) innocence and purity, and clear thee of the accusations and censures brought against thee by the Jews and the Christians." This was a grand prophecy, the sum and substance ot which may be stated in the following words. The Jews said that as Jesus had died on the cross, he had, therefore, according to the Old Testament, become accursed; and that, as the curse signified, his heart turned away from and rebelled against God, plunged into the depths of darkness, became a lover of evil, hated all good, became the enemy of God and cutting all connections with Him, became subject to the kingdom of Satan. The Christians also applied the same base appellation to Jesus, but they indiscreetly held that Jesus combined in him two opposite qualities. On the one hand, they said that Jesus was the Son of God, and on the other, that he took upon himself curse, admitting at the same time that the accursed one is the Son of Darkness and Satan, or that he himself is the Evil one. Such were the base and impious imputations brought against a holy prophet of God. The Holy Quran declared that time would come when Jesus would be cleared of these charges. This prophecy has now been clearly fulfilled. It has been conclusively proved that he did not die upon the cross and thus the curse has been removed which was attributed to him by the Jews and the Christians. It is true that the innocence of Jesus had already been established by the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet had borne testimony to the falsehood of such charges, but Divine justice willed that the fact of his being saved from dying on the cross should be as palpable

* Quran XIX, 32.

† Quran III, 48.

as was the fact of his being nailed to it, and the fulfilment of this Divine purpose has been brought about by the discovery of the tomb of Jesus which is situated at Srinagar. It is not a less remarkable fact that as the cross from which Jesus was saved was situated at Golgotha that is to say a place of a skull, so the tomb of Jesus which affords palpable evidence of his deliverance from the cross, is situated at Srinagar which also means a place of a skull. This remarkable coincidence between the significations of these two remarkable places, reveals the deep secret of the release of Jesus. Many other verses of the Holy Quran plainly speak of the natural death of Jesus and refute the idea of his death on the cross. Quoting his own words in answer to a question from God if he had taught the people to take him for God, the Holy Quran says: وكنت عليهم شهيدا ما دمت فيهم فلما توفيتنى كنت انت الرقيب عليهم "And I was a witness of their actions so long as I lived among them, but since thou, O God, hast caused me to die, thou hast watched over them." This verse tells us plainly that the Christians departed from Jesus' teachings *after his death*, because Jesus says in plain words that so long as he lived among them, he witnessed their actions and found no corruption in their beliefs and that the corruption took place after God caused him to die. Reading this verse of the Holy Quran with the one quoted in the beginning in which it is indicated that the Jews did not put Jesus to death by crucifixion, we arrive at the certain conclusion that though Jesus did not die upon the cross, yet he did die a natural death afterwards. There is moreover an admission here on the part of Jesus that he was quite ignorant of the corruption of the Christians which he could not have been if he had been alive and had personally come back into the world and with his own hands destroyed the false religion. His ignorance of Christian corruption is quite inconsistent with his second advent. In fact his reply quoted above would be a white lie if he had come back into the world and seen the false beliefs prevailing among the Christians.

In another verse the Holy Quran plainly hints at his journey to Cashmere. It says: وآوينهما الى ربوة ذات قرار ومعين "And

we gave the son of Mary and his mother a refuge on a lofty place which was secure and watered with springs." This description does not apply to any land so well as it applies to Cashmere especially when we bear in mind that there is no other country which is so like his native land Galilee in the greenness of its soil and the charming beauty of its scenes as Cashmere. Moreover, the verse plainly indicates that the refuge was given after some heavy misfortunes or great danger, for the word اوی signifies the giving of refuge in danger. But with the exception of the event of crucifixion no other event of great misfortune or danger to Jesus is recorded to have taken place. The verse, therefore, conclusively establishes that Almighty God gave refuge Jesus after the event of the crucifixion in a country which like his native land was watered with springs; in other words that Jesus did not die upon the cross but escaped to Cashmere where he passed the rest of his days in peace and tranquility.

The traditions state on the authority of trustworthy narrators that Jesus lived up to the age of 125 years. The different sects of Islam also agree that two peculiarities are found in Jesus which no other prophet combines in his person:—(1) that he attained to a full human age, *i.e.*, lived up to 125 years, and (2) that he travelled in many parts of the world, and is, therefore, known as a travelling prophet. If the statement of his ascent to heaven at the age of 33 be accepted as true, both the peculiarities come to naught, for he would neither be 125 yeare of age, nor could he at such an early age travel so much as to be reputed as a traveller. Both these reports are based not only on the most ancient and reliable books of traditions but are also widely known among all the Islamic sects. The following tradition reported by Abu Huraira is found in the Kanz-ul-'Amál, a trustworthy collection of the traditions: *اوحی اللہ تعالی الی عیسی ان یا عیسی انتقل من مکان الی مکان لئلا تعرف فتوذی, "The voice of God came to Jesus from heaven saying, O Jesus! change your habitation from one place to another, *i.e.*, travel from this country to another, lest you

* Kanz-ul-Amal, Vol. II, page 34.

should be recognised and injured." Again the same work relates another tradition on the report of Jábar: كان عيسى ابن مريم يسيح فاذا امسى اكل بقل الصحراء و يشرب ماء القراح* "The prophet Jesus used to travel and walk from one country to another. When evening came, he ate of the herbs of the forest and drank of the pure water (of fountains)." Another tradition reported by Abdulla, son of Umar, is stated in the following words: قال احب شيء الى الله الغرباء قيل اى شيء الغرباء قال الذين يفرون بدينهم و يجتمعون الى عيسى ابن مريم† "The Prophet of God (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, said, those who are *ghuraba* are dearest to God; when questioned as to what did he mean by the *ghuraba*, he said, 'The *ghuraba* are those who like Jesus Christ flee from their country, taking their religion with them, (*i.e.*, to spread it wherever they go).'" All these traditions prove conclusively that Jesus having escaped alive from the cross was directed by God to quit his native land and go to another country lest he should be seized again, and that in obedience to the Divine commandment he travelled to another country where he lived to the mature age of 125 years.

Controversy on the Sinlessness of the Prophets.

To

THE EDITOR OF THE "REVIEW OF RELIGIONS."

DEAR SIR,

Your article on the Sinlessness of the Prophets lately provoked a controversy in the *Epiphany*, a Christian weekly issued from Calcutta. Truly speaking, it could hardly be called a controversy, for both sides were not fairly represented in it. The Editor published a number of letters from the Christians and before we could say anything in defence he declared the controversy closed. What led

* Kanz-ul-Amal, Vol. II, page 72.

† Kanz-ul-Amal, Vol. VI, page 51.

him to close the controversy so prematurely is difficult to see. An Editor is at liberty to bring a controversy to close when both sides have said all they have to say on the subject and when their contributions contain nothing new. But if a controversy is carried on by one side only, it is meaningless to declare it closed. Contributions must be received from the party which is not adequately represented at any stage of the controversy. If the party fails to send any contribution, the controversy is practically closed and the Editor does not stand in need of a formal declaration that the controversy is closed. Many controversies have been started in that very paper which were never declared closed by the Editor and which came to a close simply because one of the parties ceased to send any contribution to it. For instance, in the year 1901, there was a controversy on the Quran between Hafiz Abdul Ali, B.A., on the one hand, and Messrs. Arthur, Qalandar, Goldsack, A. M. and J. M. on the other. The last letter in the controversy was from Hafiz Abdul Ali. The Editor published the letter adding that Messrs. Qalandar, A. M. and J. M. would, no doubt, come forward with their answers to the letter. But strange to say none of these gentlemen ever appeared with a reply to the letter in the columns of the *Epiphany*. The Editor did not then declare the controversy closed. On the other hand he called upon the Christian adversaries of the Hafiz to answer his letter and expressed his confidence that they would no doubt make a rejoinder to his contribution. He exhorted them not to leave the letter unanswered, but none of them ever made a response to his call. Those words of the Editor in which he called upon them to make a reply, will ever remain like an ineffaceable stigma on their foreheads. The Hafiz continued to send letters to the Editor but they were refused admission. The Editor had fully realized the shameful defeat which his party had suffered and hence he did not deem it advisable to admit more contributions from the Hafiz. Similarly there are many other instances in which the correspondence was never formally closed by the Editor but it came to a stop simply because one or other of the parties withdrew from the contest.

So in case of the controversy on the Sinlessness of the Prophets, all the correspondence was almost wholly from the Christians and no letter had yet appeared in refutation of their objections from our

side. What then did the Editor mean by closing the correspondence? If we had failed to reply to the letters published, the controversy would have of itself come to a close. But if we had sent him a letter for publication, no matter however late we would have been in sending it, he was in justice bound to publish it. Has he not been then unfair in declaring the correspondence closed, even before he had received any communication from us in reply to the Christians? He would have been justified in closing the correspondence if he had heard enough from both sides and the parties had nothing new to say. But in the present case his closing the controversy only means that he did not wish to allow us a chance for refuting the objections. He had made no announcement that the opposite party must send in its rejoinder before such and such a date and that no communication would be received after that date. Nor is it right to fix any dates for controversies of this kind. The object being to arrive at the truth, it is unjust to impose any restriction of time on such controversies. The Editor must admit communications from both sides even if they reach him after long intervals. We never dreamt that the Editor would declare the correspondence closed even before he had received any reply from us. I was about to send him a letter containing a refutation of the objections raised by the Christians when, to my indescribable disappointment, I learned that the correspondence was closed. As the Editor would no longer receive my contribution on the subject, I take the liberty to send the reply to you for publication in your valuable Magazine. I have written the reply rather at length, trusting that you will kindly allow me more space that is generally allowed to Muslim correspondents in the *Epiphany*.

I.—A REMARKABLE FEATURE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

The most remarkable feature of the controversy is the fact that the Christian correspondents have all of them carefully avoided to refer to those passages of the *Review of Religions* which contained criticism on the character of Jesus as represented in the Gospels. They have tried, tooth and nail, to refute the article on the Sinlessness of the Prophets and have done all they could to prove their sinful-

ness but, strangely enough, they have not made the least attempt to refute those passages in the *Review of Religions*, which bore on the sins of Jesus as related in the Gospels. Their primary duty was to defend Jesus, but they, instead of saying anything in his defence, have exerted themselves to the utmost of their powers to attack other holy prophets. They have received with silence the criticism on the character of Jesus, as depicted in their own scriptures, and have chosen another outlet to give vent to their inward feelings. Your comments on the word *zanb* (ذنب) have drawn many spirited articles from our Christian friends, but your criticism of Jesus on the basis of the Gospels has been passed over with silence. That your article on *zanb* (ذنب) should cause such intense excitement among the Christians, while your damaging criticism of Jesus on the basis of Gospels should not produce the least stir among them, is quite incomprehensible.

This discreet silence on their part only shows that they have nothing to say in defence and that they have allowed the case to go against them by default rather than offer unsatisfactory apologies in the defence of their master. They have made the word *zanb* (ذنب) the bone of their contention, but have taken every care not even to allude to your criticisms of Jesus on the basis of the Gospels. They could not be unaware of the attacks made in your columns on the character of Jesus as delineated in the Gospels and their refraining from saying anything in defence only shows that they are only too conscious of their inability to refute the objections raised in your columns against Jesus. If they are really able to defend Jesus what prevents them from coming forward and refuting the objections raised against Jesus on the basis of the Gospels.

II.—CHRISTIAN IGNORANCE OF ARABIC EXPOSED.

In answer to the statement that *jurm* (جرم) is never used of the holy prophets, the most foolish assertion has been made by some of the Christian correspondents in the *Epiphany* that *jurm* (جرم) is not used of the holy prophets because it never occurs in the Quran. It was no matter of wonder that such silly statements

should have been made by Christian Missionaries working in India, for their ignorance of Arabic is only too well known. Such a foolish statement was quite worthy of men who, inspite of their little or no knowledge of Arabic, try to pass for Arabic scholars and expose themselves to ridicule by presumptuously undertaking to dicuss minute linguistic points for which they are hardly competent. We are already accustomed to hear such absurd statements from these Missionary tyros, but we never deemed that the Christian Missionaries working in Arabic-speaking Muslim countries were on the same level with their brethren in India in their ignorance of Arabic. We were under the impression that the Missionaries in other Muslim lands knew Arabic better than their Indian friends, but Mr. Upson of Egypt who came in for a share in the controversy on the Sinlessness of the Prophets has undeceived us of this misconception. Many of your readers will be startled to know that this Mr. Upson who lives in Egypt was the first person to make the statement in the columns of the *Epiphany* that *jurm* (جرم) is not attributed in the Holy Quran to any one at all. This statement proceeding as it did from a Missionary of Egypt was eagerly taken up by his friends here, who set great store by it. We wonder what need there was for Mr. Upson to come in. Had we not already enough of Christian ignorance? Mr. Upson seems to be as ignorant of Arabic as many Europeans here are of Indian vernaculars. He may know something of the mutilated colloquial Arabic spoken by the Egyptians, but of pure unadulterated Arabic, he appears to be as ignorant as his friends in India. If he had been well acquainted with Arabic, he could not have made the most absurd statement that *jurm* (جرم) is not applied to any man, prophet or non-prophet in the Holy Quran. But his Indian friends hailed his statement, simply because it came from Egypt, little knowing that he was but a blind leader of the blind. The part played by one Mr. Monro of Ranaghat in this scene is amusing beyond description. Being ignorant of Arabic, he was unable to see the absurdity of Mr. Upson's assertion. Putting his faith in Mr. Upson's statement with the characteristic credulity of the ignorant, he made up his mind to make the best of it. He was simple enough to think that he had got hold of the Editor of the *Review*. He thought that the Editor had been guilty of a serious

misrepresentation and that he must not miss the opportunity of impeaching his conduct. But he could not see that he was betraying his own ignorance in seconding the most ridiculous assertion of Mr. Upson. We are not surprised at his inability to see the error of Mr. Upson's assertion, for it is just what could be expected of him. His ignorance of Arabic may serve as an excuse for his failure to see the absurdity of Mr. Upson's position. It is his impudency in impeaching the Editor that is unpardonable. He seems to be so extremely ignorant of Arabic that it would be almost impossible to make him fully realize the ludicrousness of his position. He has however learned a sad lesson this time by engaging in controversies for which he is not qualified. I hope he will profit by this exposure of his and will never make another attempt to pass for a scholar of Arabic. A jackdaw in borrowed feathers may pass for a peacock, but Mr. Monro cannot pass for an Arabic scholar.

But if he cannot sit idle and must occupy his mind in controversy I may suggest to him a safer line. The alleged sinlessness of Jesus on the authority of the Gospels has been called into question by the *Review of Religions* and the character of Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels has been subjected to very damaging criticism by the Editor of the *Review*. So it would be much better for Mr. Monro to take up this very important question for discussion and contribute a series of vigorous articles to the *Epiphany* or any other Christian organ in refutation of the sweeping criticism to which Jesus has been subjected in the pages of the *Review of Religions*. I call it a safer line of controversy because in this case there would be no danger of Mr. Monro's personal exposure though it may lead to the exposure of the man whom he superstitiously enough worships as his God. There is far greater need that he should prove the Sinlessness of Jesus on the authority of the Gospels than that he should waste his time by engaging in a controversy for which he is not fit owing to his ignorance of Arabic. But notwithstanding the fact that it is the primary and the most sacred duty of Mr. Monro to prop up the divinity of his god by proving his innocence on the authority of the Gospels, it may safely be predicted that he would never gather courage to undertake this difficult task and make an attempt to free Jesus from all those faults which may be attributed to him on the evidence of the Chris-

tian scriptures. His letters have more than once appeared in the *Epiphany*, wherein he has called to question some statements made in the *Review* but the wonderful thing is that he has allowed your criticisms of Jesus to pass uncontradicted. In spite of his overflowing zeal for the religion of the cross, he can never be expected to take up the question of the sinlessness of Jesus and refute any of the objections against Jesus. He knows full well that such an attempt on his part will only prove prejudicial rather than beneficial to his cause, the objections against Jesus being based on clear and plain words of the Gospels.

It is easy to see what led the Christian correspondents in the *Epiphany* to assert that *jurm* is not applied to any one in the Holy Quran. You wanted to prove that the Holy Quran does not hold the prophets to be sinful and in support of this you said that the Holy Quran nowhere uses *jurm* (جرم) which is the exact equivalent of sin with regard to the prophets, though the word often occurs in the Holy Book with regard to other people. You did not mean, of course, that such words as *mujrim* (مجرم), *yujrimoona* (يجرمون) *ajramu* (اجرمو), *ijram*, &c., that come from the root *jurm* (جرم) may have been used of the prophets in the Holy Quran, but that the root *jurm* (جرم) is not used of the prophets in the Holy Quran and that, therefore, it does not regard them as sinful. This could be no argument of the sinlessness of the prophets. If other words derived from the root *jurm* (جرم) were used of the prophets, the mere fact that the root *jurm* (جرم) was not used of them, could be no evidence of their innocence. *Jurm* (جرم) being a root represents all the cognate words that may be derived from it, and when you said that *jurm* جرم is never used of the prophets in the Holy Quran, though it is frequently used of other people, you evidently referred to the whole class of words represented by the root *jurm* (جرم). But the Christians had not enough knowledge of Arabic to see this. They looked for the root *jurm* (جرم) in some concordance and not finding it there they boldly came forward with the assertion that *jurm* (جرم) is not attributed to any one in the Holy Quran, not knowing that by so doing they were only betraying their own ignorance of Arabic. Being unacquainted with Arabic, it did not occur to

look for words derived from and hence represented by *jurm* (جرم). If other words derived from *jurm* (جرم) were used of the prophets, the mere fact that the root *jurm* (جرم) was not used of them, could not prove their sinlessness. Suppose *A* asserts that the word *sin* is not used of Jesus in the Gospels and, therefore, he must be regarded as sinless. But *B* is able to quote such passages as contain the words 'sinful,' 'sinner,' 'sinning,' 'sinned,' &c., used of Jesus. Would it be reasonable on the part of *A* to defend his statement by asserting that though such words as 'sinful,' 'sinner,' &c., are used of Jesus in the instances cited by *B*, yet as the word *sin* in its simple form is not used of Jesus, therefore his statement remains uncontradicted. Such a defence on the part of *A* would be evidently ridiculous. The defence of the Christians in the case of the word *jurm* (جرم) is not less ridiculous. Although almost all the words comprising the class of words derived from the root *jurm* (جرم) are frequently used in the Holy Quran, yet they assert that as the root *jurm* (جرم) in its simple form nowhere occurs in the Holy Quran, therefore the Editor of the *Review of Religions* was guilty of a grave misrepresentation when he said that *jurm* (جرم) though often used in the Holy Quran was not used even once with regard to the holy prophets; as if the Editor meant to say that such words as are derived from the root (جرم) might have been used of the prophets, but that the root itself was never used of them in the Holy Quran.

Though all the Christian correspondents of the *Epiphany* have joined in the assertion that *jurm* (جرم) is not used of the prophets because it nowhere occurs in the Holy Quran, yet they have not laid so great emphasis on the point as Mr. Monro has unfortunately done. Out of pure ignorance of Arabic, he made up his mind to turn this discovery to the greatest advantage and wasted columns of the *Epiphany* in impeaching the Editor of the *Review* for what appeared to him to be a grave misrepresentation. He seems to be so ignorant of Arabic that I do not think he will be able to realize even now the ridiculous position in which he has put himself through his ignorance of Arabic.

III.—*ZANB* USED IN THE SENSE OF HUMAN WEAKNESS.

The following considerations show that *zanb* is not always used in the sense of sin :—

(a). The Christians assert that the Holy Quran holds the prophets as sinful as ordinary mortals. If so, why does the Holy Quran not use such words as *jurm* (جرم), *fisq* (فسق), *junah* (جناح), *ism* (اثم), &c., with reference to prophets, while such words are frequently used of others than prophets by the Holy Quran? If it regards them as sinners as it regards other mortals, why does it refrain from using such words with reference to them, as it often uses with regard to other sinners? The words *fisq* (فسق), *jurm* (جرم), *ism* (اثم) and *junah* (جناح) are used about 200 times in the Holy Quran, but in spite of their being so frequently used, they are not even once used of any of the prophets. If there is no difference between *zanb* (ذنب) and *jurm* (جرم), &c., why is it that the Holy Quran has selected the word *zanb* (ذنب) for the prophets and has invariably avoided the use of *jurm* (جرم), &c., with reference to them? The use of the word *zanb* (ذنب) is very rare compared with the use of the words *jurm* (جرم), *fisq* (فسق), *ism* (اثم), &c., but in spite of this we find that the Holy Quran only uses the word *zanb* (ذنب) with reference to the holy prophets to the exclusion of the other words mentioned above, which however, are very frequently used of others than prophets. If the Holy Quran observes no difference between *zanb* (ذنب) and other words such as *jurm* (جرم), *fisq* (فسق), &c., why does it always use the word *zanb* (ذنب) and never use the words *jurm* (جرم), &c., with reference to the holy prophets. This distinction observed by the Holy Quran evidently shows that whenever God uses the word *zanb* (ذنب) with reference to the holy prophets, He does not use it as synonymous with *jurm*, (جرم), &c.

(b). Another argument advanced in the *Review of Religions* proving that *zanb* does not always mean actual sin was that God does nowhere define it as a punishable deed, while other words such as *jurm*, &c., are so defined. This evidently shows that God does not regard it as a punishable deed *in all cases*. We are nowhere told in the Holy Quran, that *every body* who commits *zanb* is liable to

punishment. But *sin* is a punishable deed, and every body who is guilty of *sin* is liable to be punished. So we must conclude that God does not regard *zanb* as the equivalent of *sin* in all cases, inasmuch as He does nowhere state that every body to whom *zanb* may be attributed is guilty of a punishable deed. There is not a single verse in the Holy Quran from which it may be inferred that God regards *zanb* as a punishable deed in all its forms.

But the Christian correspondents in the *Epiphany* seem to have bid farewell to all logic in their attempts to refute this argument. Instead of producing any verse from the Holy Quran, wherein *zanb* may have been *defined* as a punishable deed, and wherein every person guilty of *zanb* may have been declared as liable to be punished, they have loaded the columns of the *Epiphany* with verses wherein *zanb* is used in the sense of 'sin' as if we had asserted that *zanb* is never used in the sense of actual sin. Verses have been quoted from the Holy Quran showing that *mujrims* will be punished for their *zunub*. But does this show that whoever commits *zanb* will also be punished for his *zunub*? All that we can gather from these verses is that *mujrims* only are subject to punishment for their *zunub*. What we demand from our Christian friends is a verse showing that *whoever* commits *zanb* is liable to be punished. There are various verses in the Holy Quran showing that whoever commits *jurm*, *fisq*, *ism*, *kufr*, is liable to be punished, and these have been quoted at length in the articles of the *Review*, but there is not a single verse showing that pure *zanb* is punishable.

The *zanb* of a *mujrim*, *kafir*, *fasiq*, &c., is not pure *zanb*, because in these cases it is not *zanb* alone that is attributed to them. There it is coupled with the idea conveyed by the words *jurm*, *kufr*, *fisq*, &c., and, therefore, there is no ground for us to conclude that *zanb* is punishable even in the case when the ideas of *kufr*, *jurm*, *fisq*, &c., are not coupled with it. What we want our Christian friends to produce is a verse in which simple *zanb*, unaccompanied with *kufr*, *jurm*, &c., may have been described as punishable with hell-fire. If a *mujrim*, a *kafir*, or a *fasiq* is threatened with hell-fire for his *zanb*, we cannot conclude thereby that prophets to whom *jurm*, *kufr*, and *fisq* are nowhere attributed in the Holy Quran, are also liable to

be punished for their *zanb*. The Christians must show on the authority of the Holy Quran that a person to whom *zanb* alone is attributed and to whom no additional idea of *jurm, fisq, ism*, &c., is ascribed is as liable to be punished with hell-fire as a *mujrim* or an *asim*.

Now in the Holy Quran God only uses the word *zanb* of the prophets which He nowhere describes as punishable in all its forms and refrains from using the words *jurm, fisq, kufr, ism*, &c., which He defines as punishable in all cases. This clearly shows that God does not treat them as persons that are in the danger of being cast into hell as He regards those of whom He uses the words *jurm, fisq*, &c. Here, it must be borne in mind that we are bound only to show that the Holy Quran observes a difference between the words *zanb* and *jurm*. We are not bound to show whether any other writer observes this difference. We are not concerned with other writers. There is a large number of words used by the Holy Quran in a sense in which they are not used by any earlier writer. New sense was to be attached to certain words to express new ideas unknown to pagan Arabia.

(c.) The Christians assert that the prophets are as liable to sin as any other man, and that there is no difference between the Holy Messengers and other mortals in this respect. This is contradicted by the Holy Quran. It does draw a distinction between the prophets and other men in respect of sinfulness. When certain men suspected the Holy Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم to have taken an undue share of the booty, God answered their suspicions by saying : ما کان لنبی ان یغل "A Prophet cannot be guilty of embezzlement." The form in which the charge is refuted shows at least that God does not hold the holy prophets to be on a level with other people in the matter of sinfulness. He could refute the charge by saying that the Holy Prophet did not commit embezzlement in this case. On the other hand, God denies the very possibility of such an act on the part of any prophet, great or small. This clearly shows that in the point of sinfulness, the prophets are not on a par with other men as the Christians think them to be. God speaks here only of one form of sin because it was this sin which was laid to the charge of the Holy Prophet in the present case and it was of this charge alone that God wanted to clear the Holy Prophet.

(d.) It has been asserted by the Christians that *istighfar* is a prayer for the forgiveness of sins actually committed and that it, therefore, follows an actual commission of sin, and that there can be no *istighfar* in case there is no actual sin. This statement is wrong for more reasons than one. Firstly, the *literal* meaning of the word falsifies the assertion. It literally means "asking for covering or protection." The words asking the protection of God from sins, evidently refer not only to sins actually committed but also to sins that may possibly be committed. We feel a natural desire to pray to God not only for the forgiveness of sins actually committed but also for protection against sins that may be committed and *istighfar* is only an expression of the desire which we naturally feel. We desire to be free not only from the punishment of sins but also from the bondage of sin, and *istighfar* being a prayer for protection from sins, must be an expression of both these desires. It is unjust to confine it to the former desire only. Secondly, there are several verses in the Holy Quran which show beyond the shadow of a doubt that *istighfar* is not necessarily a prayer for sins actually committed, but that we may say *istighfar* even in cases where there is no actual commission of sin.

(1). *Istighfar* in the Holy Quran is often counted with virtues and enjoined as a virtue of the highest order. Thus it is said: الصبرين والصدقين والقنتين والمنفقين والمستغفرين بالاسحار "Those who are patient, true, obedient, who spend their money for the sake of God and say *istighfar*." There are many other verses of similar import in the Holy Quran.

(2). Another verse which shows, beyond all doubt, that *istighfar* does not imply sinfulness runs as follows: نورهم يسعى بين ايديهم وبايمانهم يقولون ربنا اتمم لنا نورنا واغفرلنا انك على كل شيء قدير (التحريم) God speaking of those in paradise says: "Their light shall run in front of them and on their right; they shall say, Our Lord, perfect our light and grant us *maghfirat*, for thou art powerful over all things." In this verse we are told that those living in paradise shall say *istighfar*. Their *istighfar* cannot be for sins, there being no commission of sins in paradise. Nor can they say *istighfar* for sins committed by them in the world, for we learn from the verse immediately preceding

the foregoing verse that they shall have their sins pardoned before their entry into paradise. The verse runs thus: عسى ربكم ان يكفر عنكم سيا تكم ويد خلكم جنت تجرى من تحتها الانها ر "Your Lord will pardon your sins and cause you to enter into paradise." So, their *istighfar* shall not be for sins. What they shall say *istighfar* for, may be inferred from the words of the verse itself. There being no limit to the light of God, the light possessed by them shall appear to them imperfect compared with what they may still possess. With this consciousness of their defect, they shall ask God to complete their light and thus cover their defective state. The light of God being unlimited, they shall never be satisfied with any quantity of light, and shall thus ever continue to ask for more and more light. This verse clearly shows that *istighfar* is a prayer for spiritual progress. There being no limit to spiritual advancement, the prophets of God are incessantly engaged in *istighfar*, ever asking for more and more light. They may attain to any stage of spiritual progress, but they are never satiated with what they have gained. The more they move on in their spiritual career, the more they are conscious of their position being far inferior to that to which they may yet attain. So they are ever engaged in *istighfar*, praying God to cover their defective state and grant them the full measure of light. It is for this reason that God revealed the following verse to the Holy Prophet: قل رب زد نى علما "Say (O Prophet), my Lord, grant me more and more knowledge of Thee," thus intimating that there can be no limit to the knowledge of God, who is infinite.

In short, the fact that those residing in paradise shall say *istighfar*, conclusively proves that *istighfar* does not necessarily imply sinfulness, and that we are required to say *istighfar* in order that our weakness may be covered and that strength may be granted us for our spiritual progress. The Christians will be guilty of injustice if they still insist on saying that *istighfar* is always a prayer for the forgiveness of sins. The use of the word by the Holy Quran clearly negatives the above assertion. The wide signification attached to the word by the Holy Quran is quite consistent with the *literal* sense of the word, which originally signifies 'asking for covering or protection.'

(3.) Another verse of the Holy Quran showing that *istighfar* is

not always meant for sins actually committed is as follows: فسبح بحمد ربک و استغفرہ انہ کان توابا (النصر) In the foregoing verse, God enjoins upon the Holy Prophet to say *istighfar*. This verse was revealed shortly before the death of the Holy Prophet. In conjunction with this verse we must take the verse: انا فتحنا لک فتحا مبینا لیغفر لک اللہ ما تقدم من ذنبک وما تاخر This verse was revealed before the conquest of Mecca and, therefore, long before the verse in which God enjoins on the Holy Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم to say *istighfar*. The Christians would interpret the verse as follows: "We have granted thee an obvious victory so that we may forgive thy sins, both first and last." This is the Christian interpretation of the verse* and, therefore, the Christians must admit that God forgave the sins of the Holy Prophet, both first and last. Now when God had forgiven the Holy Prophet his sins, both first and last, why did He again enjoin upon him to say *istighfar*? So admitting the Christian interpretation of the verse: لیغفر لک اللہ ما تقدم من ذنبک وما تاخر we must conclude that when God required His Prophet to say *istighfar* after He had forgiven him all his sins, both first and last, He did not require him to ask pardon for sins committed, for his sins were already forgiven him. How could it be possible that God should have first granted him pardon and then asked him to pray for pardon. Was the Holy Prophet required to ask pardon for the sins which were already pardoned? So the Christians must admit that *istighfar* in the verse واستغفرہ is not equivalent to a prayer for the forgiveness of sins. Here it only means a prayer for the covering of human weakness, a supplication to God to grant strength, power and support and facilitate the journey to the spiritual goal. The context also supports this interpretatian. In the *sura* in which the verse occurs, God speaks of the triumphant career of the Holy Prophet صلی اللہ

*This interpretation is evidently wrong, inasmuch as it destroys the very sense of the verse. A victory has nothing to do with the forgiveness of sins, and the forgiveness of sins cannot follow as a consequence of victory. Here the word ذنب refers to the charges of imposture, &c., attributed to the Holy Prophet. God granted the Holy Prophet success which was a sign of his truth and thus by granting him the victory, God removed all the charges of imposture, falsehood, &c., which were imputed to him by the infidels. God made his mission a complete success and destroyed his enemies and thus testified to his truth. This interpretation is supported by the context.

and his brilliant success as a prophet. The *sura* hints at his approaching end and exhorts the Holy Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم to be wholly engaged in prayer during the few remaining days of his life.

(4.) It has been said by the Christians that there can be no *istighfar* unless there has been an actual commission of sin and that the more one resorts to *istighfar*, the more he is sinful. Such a conclusion is evidently contradicted by the Holy Quran. The Holy Prophet said *istighfar* about a hundred times a day and this practice of his lasted as long as he lived. Now according to the Christians, this repeated *istighfar* shows "the depraved state of a sinful nature." But the Holy Quran speaks of the character of the Holy Prophet in very laudable terms. It says: انک لعلی خلق عظیم "Verily thou art of excellent morals." قل ان صلوتی ونسکی ومحیای ومماتی للہ رب العلمین say "My prayer and my sacrifice, my life and my death are all for God." Again God speaks of him as the sun that sheds light. Now all this clearly contradicts the conclusion that the repeated *istighfar* of the Holy Prophet shows 'the depraved state of a sinful nature.' This shows that *istighfar* is not always accompanied with an actual commission of sin. Had it been so, God would not have spoken of the Holy Prophet in such terms as the above.

(5). Again God requires us to follow and imitate every word and deed of the Holy Prophet, He says: لقد کان لکم فی رسول اللہ اسوۃ حسنۃ "Verily, there is for you an excellent model to follow in the Holy Prophet," and again ان کنتم تحبون اللہ فاتبعونی یحببکم اللہ "If you love God, follow me and God will love you." Now if the deeds and words of the Holy Prophet were not free from error, why did God bind us to follow him in all his actions. When God exhorts us to follow Abraham, he adds an exception,* but in the case of the Holy

* Here reference is to the following verses of the Holy Quran :—

قد کانت لکم اسوۃ حسنۃ فی ابراھیم . . . . . الا قول ابراہیم لابیہ لاستغفرن لک (الممتحنۃ) وما کان استغفار ابراہیم لابیہ الا عن موعدۃ وعدھا ایاہ فلما تبین لہ انہ عدو للہ تبرا منہ ان ابراہیم لاواہ حلیم پ ۱۱ ع ۳

"There is a good model for you in Abraham . . . . . excepting his words to his father 'I will ask God to pardon you.' (Al-Mumtahina). The *istighfar* of Abraham for his father was owing to a promise which he had made to him, but when it became clear to him that he was an enemy of God, he declared himself free from him, verily Abraham was pitiful and gentle (Tauba)."

Prophet He makes no exception at all. Every word and deed of the Holy Prophet is a law for us. This, then, shows that all the deeds and words of the Holy Prophet were free from error.

IV.—IS JESUS SINLESS ACCORDING TO THE QURAN?

Mr. A. M. in the *Epiphany* of 29th November, states in the beginning of his letter that like the Bible, the Quran also supports the theory that all men are sinners with the sole exception of Jesus. Putting aside, for the present, the question of the sinlessness of Jesus on the authority of the Bible, I hasten to inform him that if the words *istighfar* and *zanb* do signify sinfulness, the Holy Quran declares Jesus also to be sinful.

(*a*). The Holy Quran says: يستغفرون لمن فى الارض *i.e.*, the angels say *istighfar* for all those that are in earth. Here we are told that angels say *istighfar* for all mankind. Now if *istighfar* necessarily implies sinfulness, we must hold that Jesus was also a sinner, for he also according to the Holy Quran, is included in mankind.

(*b*). The Holy Quran again tells us that the angels say *istighfar* particularly for those who believe. The verse runs thus: يستغفرون للذين امنوا The Holy Quran divides all men into two main classes, *viz.*, the believers and the unbelievers. Jesus, according to the Holy Quran belonged to the former class for whom the angels are reported to say *istighfar*, and if *istighfar* denotes sinfulness, the Christians must admit that Jesus was also a sinner.

(*c*). We learn from the Holy Quran that all the prophets believed in the Holy Prophet. The verse runs thus: واذ اخذ الله ميثاق النبيين لما آتيتكم من كتاب وحكمة ثم جاءكم رسول مصدق لما معكم لتؤمنن به Mr. A. M. offers a curious translation of the words واذ اخذ الله ميثاق النبين In order to translate it, he resorts to another verse in the Holy Quran, *viz.*, لقد اخذنا ميثاق بنى اسرائيل and tries to amalgamate both. The latter verse means 'God accepted the covenant of the Israelites' and the former verse, being an exactly similar construction must, therefore, mean 'God accepted the covenant of prophets.' Both constructions are grammatically similar and if لقد اخذنا ميثاق

بنی اسرائیل means 'God accepted a covenant of the Israelites' the other clause must mean 'when God accepted a covenant of the prophets.' We have only to substitute, *the prophets* instead of *the Israelites*, the clauses being exactly similar in every other respect. But Mr. A. M. instead of giving it an interpretation similar to that which he gives to the other clause, puts a most ungrammatical construction on the words. He says that the words اخذ اللہ میثاق النبیین mean 'God accepted the covenant from *the Israelites in the matter of* the prophets.' The words in *italics* are thrust in by Mr. A. M. without there being any thing corresponding to them in the original Arabic. He translates میثاق بنی اسرائیل as "covenant of the Israelites" and in the same breath he translates میثاق النبیین as "covenant of the Israelites in the matter of the prophets." Both expressions are exactly alike, only we have the word نبیین (Prophets) in the one for بنی اسرائیل in the other. So if he translates میثاق بنی اسرائیل as "covenant of the Israelites" he is bound to translate میثاق النبیین as "covenant of the prophets." So there is no reason to doubt that if God speaks of a contract with the Israelites in the one case, he speaks of a contract with the prophets in the other.

The objection that there was no living prophet in the life-time of the Holy Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم to believe in him and to assist him is worthless. We learn from the verse that God made this contract with every prophet that appeared before our Holy Prophet and it was the prophets and not the people who received this inspiration from God. But it was the duty of the prophets to communicate this command of the Lord to their respective people and to enjoin upon them to believe in and assist the Promised Prophet. They could not do so without believing in the Prophet. This verse conclusively proves that all the prophets preceding the Holy Prophet believed in the Holy Prophet inasmuch as they were foretold of his appearance by God.

If Mr. A. M's. objection is applicable to our interpretation, it is much more so to his interpretation. If the contract was made with the Israelites, it must have been made with a particular generation of the Israelites. If the prophets could not live for ever, that generation of the Israelites also could not live for ever. The generation

with whom the contract was made must have passed away with the prophet in whose life-time they lived and they could not live to see even the appearance of the immediately succeeding prophet, to say nothing of the prophet whose advent is foretold in the verse under question. The generation with whom the contract was made must have been dead and gone long before the appearance of the Holy Prophet. So in both cases the persons with whom the contract was made, could not personally witness the appearance of the Holy Prophet, and in both cases, the instructions of God were to be carried out by their representatives living at the time of the appearance of the Holy Prophet. We have only to see with whom the contract was made and the verse clearly shows that the contract was made with the prophets. Receiving the inspiration from God, it was the duty of the prophets to communicate the command of God to their people and to enjoin upon them to believe in and assist the promised Prophet. But they could not exhort others to believe in the Holy Prophet unless they themselves believed in him. Their assistance of the Holy Prophet consisted in exhorting their respective people to accept and help the Prophet when he appeared. Now Jesus also was one of the prophets spoken of in the verse and he also having received an inspiration from God regarding the advent of the Holy Prophet, must have enjoined upon his followers to believe in the Holy Prophet and aid him in his mission and must have been himself a believer in the truth of the Holy Prophet. God, again, enjoins upon the Holy Prophet to say *istighfar* for all believers, He says: استغفر لذنبك وللمومنين والمومنات "Say *istighfar* for thy *zanb* and for the men and women that believe in Thee." If *istighfar* implies sinfulness of the man for whom *istighfar* is said, we must conclude that Jesus was also a sinner, for the Holy Quran includes him in the men and women that believed in the Holy Prophet.

V.—IS NOT THE WORD *JURM* USED OF THE JEWS ?

It has been asserted by the Christian correspondents in the *Epiphany* that if *jurm* is not used of the holy prophets of God in the Holy Quran, it is not also used of the Jews. This statement of theirs is another proof of their ignorance of Arabic. *Jurm* is attributed to the Jews in more places than one. I give here only three

of the verses in which the Jews are described as guilty of *jurm*. God says: وعلى الذين هادوا حرمنا كل ذى ظفر ومن البقر والغنم حرمنا عليهم شحومهما الا ما حملت ظهورهما او الحوايا او ما اختلط بعظم ذالك جزيناهم ببغيهم وانا لصدقون • فان كذبوك فقل ربكم ذو رحمة واسعة ولا يرد باسه عن القوم المجرمين الانعام—ركوع ١٨ "We forbade the Jews all animals of uncloven hoofs, as well as the fat of the cow and the goat, excepting that which is borne by their backs or arteries or which is mixed with the bones. This was a punishment to them for their transgression and verily we are truthful, so if they have given the lie to thee, say unto them that thy Lord is of great mercy and his wrath is not turned away from people that are *mujrims*." In this verse the Jews are described as *mujrims* or guilty of *jurm*. Again, we have the following verse: ولقد ارسلنا من قبلك رسلا الى قومهم فجاءوهم بالبينت فانتقمنا من الذين اجرموا وكان حقا علينا نصر المومنين "We sent before thee prophets to their people and they came with signs. Then we revenged ourselves on the *mujrims* and it was necessary for us to assist the believers." In this verse the enemies of all the prophets that went before the Holy Prophet of Arabia are described as *mujrim* or guilty of *jurm*. Jesus immediately preceded the Holy Prophet and his enemies must have been *mujrims*. Now, we ask our Christian friends whether the Jews who brought Jesus to the gallows were the friends or the enemies of Jesus. If they were his friends, then certainly they were not *mujrims*. But if they were his enemies, then the Holy Quran declares them to be guilty of *jurm*. Another verse which describes the Jews as *mujrims* runs thus: وكذلك جعلنا لكل نبى عدوا من المجرمين "Likewise every prophet had his enemies from among the *mujrims*." In this verse, too, as in the preceding one, the enemies of every prophet are called *mujrims*. The Jews being the enemies of Jesus, and of our Holy Prophet are included among the *mujrims*. The Christian correspondents must feel ashamed of their foolish assertion that the Holy Quran nowhere attributes *jurm* to the Jews. This assertion of theirs is no less ridiculous than their statement that the word *jurm* nowhere occurs in the Holy Quran. Indeed this assertion is as good an illustration of their ignorance of Arabic as the other. More verses might be quoted to show that the Holy Quran does describe the Jews as *mujrims*, but these their, I think

will suffice to bring the Christians to a sense of shame, if they have any at all.

These Christian correspondents not only lack a knowledge of Arabic, but they do not also seem to possess much of intelligence. Even if the Holy Quran had not used the word *jurm* with regard to the Jews, this could not have placed them on a par with the holy prophets. God almost exhausts the whole vocabulary in condemning the conduct of the Jews. They are spoken of as *fasiq*, *mal'un*, *kafir*, *bagi*, *mutadin*, *zalim*, *shayatin*, *qirad*, *maghzub alaihim*, &c. In the face of these epithets used of the Jews, if the Holy Quran had omitted to use the word *jurm* (which it does not) with regard to them, could they have been regarded as sinless like the holy prophets of whom none of these words is used in the Holy Quran.

VI.—TRADITIONS ON THE QUESTION OF SINLESSNESS.

The attempt of the Christians to draw any conclusions from the *words* of traditions is fruitless. They must first prove that these are the exact words spoken by the Holy Prophet and then they should base their conclusions on them. Conclusions merely based on the words of traditions are not sound, for they do not stand on a sure and sound basis. Christians may base their conclusions on the words of the Holy Quran but not on the words of the traditions for the latter cannot be said to reproduce the exact words of the Holy Prophet.

The Christians have tried to infer sinfulness from the words of the prayers recorded in the traditions but they have shut their eyes to the traditions in which the Holy Prophet plainly declares his Sinlessness. For their information, I quote here a tradition from Muslim which is a clear evidence of the sinlessness of the Holy Prophet. The tradition is as follows:—

وعن ابن مسعود قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما منكم من احد
الا وقد وكل به قرينه من الجن وقرينه من الملئكة قالوا وايا ك يا رسول الله
قال وايا ى • ولكن الله اعا ننى عليه فا سلم فلا يا مرنى الا بخير

In Masud says: "The Prophet said 'There is none of you but

has two companions with him, an evil spirit and a good spirit.' The people asked 'Do *you* also, O Prophet, have the two spirits with you.' 'Yes,' replied the Holy Prophet, 'but God has given me power over the evil one and it has become a Muslim and tells me to do naught but good.'" Thus we see that traditions afford the clearest testimony of the Sinlessness of the Holy Prophet. It is impossible to find any authentic tradition relating any sin of the Holy Prophet.

VII.—DOES THE QURAN RELATE THE SINS OF THE PROPHETS?

The Christians assert that the Holy Quran relates the sins of certain prophets; let us see whether the Holy Quran lends any support to their assertion.

As to Adam, God Himself defends his conduct in eating the forbidden fruit by saying ولم نجد له عزما *i.e.*, "We did not find his intention," *i.e.*, he did not do the deed intentionally. Now, the sin lies in the intention. If a person drink poison, knowing that it is poison, and will result in his death, he is guilty of a sin. But if he drink it unknowingly, he must suffer the consequences, but he cannot be said to have sinned. The same was the case with Adam. He received the fruit from the hands of Eve (as we learn from the Bible) not knowing that it was the forbidden fruit and ate it. His deed was indeed against the commandment of God, but he did not violate the commandment knowingly. So he cannot be said to have sinned. The deed of eating the fruit was followed by its consequences, just as drinking poison will be followed by its consequences, for nature must have its course; but there was no sin, for there was no intention.

Adam was never guilty of *shirk*. *Shirk* is an unpardonable sin, which no holy man of God can commit. The verse to which the Christian correspondents refer does not contain the name of Adam. It only speaks of the general tendency of man to be involved in *shirk*.

The blow dealt by Moses was in good cause. It was in the

defence of one of his party against a foe. The death was accidental. He did not intend to kill the man. God does not accuse him of any sin. Aaron is accused by the Christians of 'aiding and abetting idolatry.' This is falsehood pure and simple. All we learn from the Holy Quran is that he *could not* in the absence of Moses, prevent the Israelites from worshipping the calf.

The story of Uriah is nowhere mentioned in the Holy Quran. 'Learned Zamakhshari' and 'the learned commentator Jalal-ud-Din' may quote any number of false stories from the Bible. The Holy Quran is not responsible for such fables.

Jesus said that he would show no other sign but that of Jonas. Did he mean that he too would commit a sin like that of Jonas. It is pity that what Jesus called a miracle of Jonah, Christians of to-day call a sin or the punishment of sin.

Is it not meet for the Christians to acquit Jesus of sins related in the Gospels rather than make fruitless attempts to prove the sinfulness of other prophets?

Yours truly,

QADIAN. SHER ALI.

Dr. Lefroy on the Moral Tone of India.

The Bishop of Lahore writing in the "East and West," a quarterly Missionary Magazine, makes some very unjustifiable remarks regarding the moral depravity of India. He says: "An almost entire absence of faith as a principle of life, a low degraded moral tone, a blunted consciousness of sin, which leaves the individual scarcely capable of shame or honest repentance in any way, except a very intense desire to escape punishment—these are some of the prominent conditions of life; and these, when they have sunk through long centuries into the very blood of the people and sapped their life, will make us scarcely wonder if results of missionary labour do not make themselves seen as immediately or as abundantly as we might wish." In these sweeping remarks regarding the moral depravity of India, the Bishop ought in

justice to Christianity at least have made an exception in favor of the sweepers, the Pariahs and several other low classes of the Hindu community, and then perhaps even the Hindus and Muhammadans would not have been pained at this remark of the good Bishop. As regards the Muslims of India we intend to discuss the Bishop's judgment of their faith and morals as well as his attack on the principle of the seclusion of women at length in some subsequent issue, but before doing so we wish to put some plain questions to which we hope to receive definite answers from his Lordship. The Bishop refers to a "blunted consciousness of sin" in the whole population of India. Will he kindly inform the public if drunkenness is a sin? If so, does it not prevail to a far greater extent in Europe and other Christian countries than in any Muslim country? Is it not true that drunkenness is the root from which every other evil springs? Is it not in fact the only thing which makes men bold in the commission of sin and blunts their consciousness of it? Is not the drunkard quite blind to all social and moral laws? Has not drunkenness wrought the worst development of all the great vices in the Christian countries? Again, we stand in need of hearing the judgment of his Lordship as to prostitution. Is it a sin? If so, is it not true that Christian countries have almost a monoply of it when compared with the Muslim? Higher church dignitaries than the Bishop of Lahore have held so, and Dr. Lefroy, we hope, would not overlook the fact in answering the questions so necessary for the solution of the problem of India's moral depravity that nothing excites the lust and sets astir the animal passions to such a high degree as wine. Does his Lordship moreover look upon gambling as a sin or not? If he does, will he kindly point out the country where it prevails most of all? We wish to hear it from his Lordship's lips. But if the Bishop thinks that drunken ness, prostitution and gambling are not sins, we wish to be informed what sin is? The Bishop may however answer that though these are sins for non-Christians, yet the Christian is absolved of them by the blood of Jesus and these are not sins when practised by him. In that case we shall have to keep the same silence as in answer to a follower of the *Sakat mat* who holds that incest is legalised by the superior power of his *mantras*.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] JULY, 1903. No. 7.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

Monro on Sinlessness.

Mr. Monro of the Ranaghat Medical Mission has "by the courtesy of the Editor of the *Epiphany*" brought out a pamphlet on the sinlessness of the prophets which forms a second part to another small pamphlet published by him previously on the same subject. For our own part we were waiting also for a second part from the pen of that able Missionary gentleman, but we had a strong hope that Mr. Monro would turn his attention to the question of the sinlessness of the man whom he quite superstitiously worshipped as his God. We were anxious to hear something from him on this important question, but we have been disappointed. But as Mr. Monro comes to India as an Evangelist of the Gospel of Jesus, we hope he would not lose an early opportunity to issue a third part justifying the words and deeds of his master as narrated in the Gospels.

The doctrine of the sinlessness of the prophets is one which is owned by an overwhelming majority of the Muslims. Some individuals may have called it into question, but their individual opinions do not carry the least weight against the firm belief of almost the whole of the Muhammadan world. It is very probable that such opinions were introduced into Islam by converts from other faiths who when coming over to the new religion, brought something of their old creeds with them. It is absolutely dishonest on the part of the Christian Missionaries to represent the Holy Quran and all its learned and trustworthy commentators as denying the sinlessness of the prophets. Most of the stories which Mr. Monro regards as certain proof of the sinfulness of the prophets, and which are not to be found in the Holy Quran, have been rejected

as false and fictitious by learned and trustworthy authorities on commentary. The words of the Quran do not lend the least support to the charges which the Ranaghat Missionary has boldly brought forward against the prophets of God alleging them to be based on the Holy Quran. No dishonesty is more to be condemned than that which deceives the public by asserting that such is the opinion of learned Muslim commentators, whereas as a matter of fact such opinion is condemned by learned commentators. Moreover the opinion of any commentator is not merely as such of any authority. The commentaries of the Holy Quran are not regarded by the Muslims as the Word of God. Meanings of particular words and expressions if traced through an unbroken channel to the Holy Prophet of God, are no doubt binding, but it cannot be shown that under any of the verses on which the sinfulness of the prophets is alleged to be based, the stories related are on the authority of the Holy Prophet. We have the words of the Quran with every pause and vowel-point exactly as the Holy Prophet delivered them, and in most cases it can be determined easily what interpretation or construction suits the context or is in accordance with the spirit of the Quran. The Quran is to be read as a whole and many portions of it explain one another. For this reason in considering the following points raised by Mr. Monro, we will refer only to the words of the Holy Book and regarding any particular word shall adopt the interpretation which is in consonance with other parts and which is supported by the Holy Quran itself. Any reference to a commentary will be made only as a corroborative testimony, but we shall take nothing except the Holy Quran for the basis of our remarks. If the Christian Missionaries wish to carry on the controversy honestly, they should disprove our statements on the basis of the Holy Quran, and instead of concealing the passages in trustworthy Muslim commentators rejecting the fictitious stories told by them in support of their charges, should plainly avow that reliable authorities on commentary such as Imam Razi, the author of the Tafsir-i-Kabir or the Great Commentary, condemn the false statements they have brought forward. We shall show, if necessary, in some subsequent issue of the Magazine that all the reliable commentaries have rejected the views now advocated by Mr. Monro, as pure falsehood.

We shall first discuss the nature of the deeds which are enumerated as the sins of the prophets by Mr. Monro, and will then consider other sides of the question including the meaning of the word *zanb*. On *istighfar* we gave a full discussion in the February number, and will, therefore, refer our readers to that number for the significance of this important word.

As remarked in a previous issue, sin is an intentional disobedience of the commandments of God rendering a person liable to punishment from God. Unless there is a commandment of God brought to the knowledge of the offender, an intention on his part to break that commandment, and a liability to punishment following that act, there is no sin. To establish the sin of a person, these three requisites must be satisfied in each case. Before considering the nature of the deeds alleged to be the sins of the prophets and the circumstances under, or the intention with, which they were done, we must draw the reader's attention to the noteworthy point that the prophets of God have all been declared to be everlastingly free from every sort of punishment. The Holy Quran says of them in plain words in the chapter entitled the "Prophets" ان الذين سبقت لهم منا الحسنى اولئك عنها مبعدون لا يسمعون حسيسها وهم فى ما اشتهت انفسهم خلدون • لا يحزنهم الفزع الاكبر وتتلقهم الملئكة هذا يومكم الذى كنتم توعدون "Verily they for whom we have before ordained the good reward shall be far away from it (*i.e.*, hell-fire); its slightest sound they shall not hear, and in that which their souls longed for, shall they abide for ever. The great terror shall not trouble them; and the angels shall meet them with the glad tidings 'This is your day which you were promised.'" But the object of the Christian Missionaries is not to seek or find out the truth. Their object is simply to find out objections and hence they do not study the Holy Quran as a whole but take it piecemeal and whether there appears to them any ground or not, they deem it a sacred duty and useful service to their master to pick up faults with the holy prophets of God and to hurl abuses and anathemas at their heads.

ADAM'S EATING OF THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT.

The nature of Adam's disobedience in this respect is clearly

determined by a verse preceding this story in the chapter entitled "*Ta ha.*" It is plainly written there: ولقد عهدنا الى ادم من قبل فنسي ولم نجد له عزما "Verily we gave to Adam a commandment previously but he forgot and we did not find in him any determination or intention to break it." This verse clears Adam of the charge that he intentionally broke the commandment of God. The verse not only states in plain terms that Adam forgot but also negatives his intention and thus doubly acquits him of the false charge. As intention is a necessary element in sin, as we have already defined it, therefore the act of Adam in eating of the forbidden fruit does not amount to a sin. This verse is immediately followed by the story of his being deceived by Satan and of eating of the fruit, and thus it settles the point conclusively that the forgetfulness and the absence of intention refer only to this commandment. Adam did disobey the commandment of God, but he never intended to disobey and through forgetfulness did a deed the result of which was that the commandment of God was broken. We may term the result as disobedience, but so far as Adam is concerned, the deed cannot be called a sin. The element of intention is altogether wanting, and Almighty God Himself clears Adam of the charge of sin in this matter. Now forgetfulness is a natural human weakness, and it is for this reason that immediately after eating of the forbidden fruit through forgetfulness, Adam prays to God for His strength and support against this human weakness. The meaning of *istighfar* has already been discussed at length and we need not recur to it here. In the verse وعصى آدم ربه فغوى the *'isyan* or disobedience was the result of forgetfulness and, therefore, not a sin, and غوى means as explained by the famous lexicon *Lisan-ul-Arab* فسد عليه عيشه "his peace was disturbed," and, therefore, these words cannot serve as a basis for any objection and do not lead to the conclusion that Adam was a sinner.

THE CHARGE OF *SHIRK* AGAINST ADAM.

Mr. Monro ascribes *shirk* to Adam with an audacity worthy of himself. He says: "In *Sura Al-Araf*, verse 190, it is distinctly stated that Adam was guilty of the grave sin of idolatry." We

ask if there is any honesty left among these Christian Missionaries, Will Mr. Monro let us know if the name of Adam occurs in that verse at all? If not, was it honest on his part to attribute the grave sin of *shirk* to a prophet knowing that the Holy Quran teemed with verses showing that it was to uproot the evil of *shirk* that prophets were sent by God. Has he moreover never read in the Holy Quran regarding *shirk* the words ان الله لا يغفر ان يشرک به ويغفر ما دون ذلک لمن يشاء "Verily God never forgiveth that other gods should be set up with Him and forgiveth whatever He willeth besides that." There were many considerations by which he could have seen the absurdity of such a charge, had he been actuated by an honest motive.

Before considering the words of the verse on whose basis the charge is brought forward, it is necessary to draw the reader's attention to the subject matter of the *Sura Al Araf* in which the verse occurs, and the arrangement thereof. Beginning with the revelation of the Holy Quran, the *sura* at first relates at great length the story of the creation of Adam, of the commandment to the angels, of forbidding the fruit, of the deception practised by Iblis upon Adam and Eve and of their fall. Then there is a general dissertation as to the deeds and the reward of the virtuous and the wicked, and this is followed by the stories of the prophets whose enemies were destroyed by God, because they did not turn to the worship of one God on their preaching, each prophet saying to his people يقوم اعبدوا الله ما لكم من اله غيره "O my people! worship God, besides Him you have no other God," and thus the whole teaching of the chapter is against *shirk*. First, there is Noah, then Hud, then Salih, then Lot, then Shuaib, and last of all the story of Moses and of his preaching to Pharoah and the Israelites is related at full length. After this follows an address to the enemies of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. They are first told that *shirk* is not the impression upon the soul of man, but that the natural impression is that of the Divine unity; then they are threatened with punishment and a destruction near at hand if they continue to persist in *shirk* and the rejection of the signs of God. Then it is said of them يسئلونک عن الساعة "They question thee when this hour of des-

truction shall come," and they are told that it will surely come when God will it and it is said لا تا تيكم ا لا بغتة "It shall not come to *you* but suddenly," and that "I am only a warner beforehand." This verse is immediately followed by the verse هو ا لذ ى خلقكم من نفس وا حدة وجعل منها زوجها ليسكن ا ليها فلما تغشها حملت حملا خفيفا فمرت به فلما ا ثقلت د عوا ا لله ر بهما لئن ا تيتنا صلحا لنكو نن من الشكر ين • فلما ا تهما صلحا جعلا له شركا ء فيما ا تهما فتعلى ا لله عما يشركو ن "It is He that created you from one soul," (it should be noted that there has been no change in the address and so it is the idolatrous enemies of the Holy Prophet that are addressed in this verse) "and created his mate of the same kind that he might dwell with her; and when he had known her, she bore a light burden and went about with it; and when it became heavy, they both cried to God their Lord, 'surely if Thou give us a perfect child, we will be of the thankful,' yet when God had given them a perfect child, they two set up other gods with Him in what he had given them two. But high be God exalted above the partners these people (*i.e.*, the idolatrous people) join with Him." The last words of the verse clearly show that Adam and Eve are not spoken of in these verses, because had it been their *shirk*, the concluding words ought to have been "But high is God exalted above what *the two joined* with Him." But actually there is neither the dual number nor the past tense, and hence it is clear that the story related is of all the *mushriks* then present and not of two persons with whom there was no third person at that time which should have necessitated the plural number of the verb.

Various other considerations show that Adam and Eve are not here described. In the first place the story of Adam has been related at full length in the beginning of the *sura* and hence had this circumstance been about him, it would have been related there Secondly, the arrangement of the subject matter of the *sura* shows that all the prophets have been spoken of in order beginning with Adam and ending with the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. It is, therefore, the enemies of the prophet who are addressed in the verse, as they are also spoken of in the previous verses. Thirdly, the name of Adam is not mentioned in the verses and the arrangement of the subject

matter rebuts any such presumption. Fourthly, the story of Adam's eating of the forbidden fruit is related several times in the Holy Quran, though that circumstance having occurred through forgetfulness, there was no fault on Adam's part. Had Adam been guilty of the heinous crime of *shirk*, reference to it ought to have been at least as frequent as to the slip in eating of the forbidden fruit. But the wonder is that it is never spoken of even once in the Holy Quran, and the verse in which it is alleged to be related, does not even give the name of Adam. That such importance should have been given to the slight slip of a man and his heinous offence of *shirk* should not have been even once referred to in plain and distinct terms, is quite incomprehensible. Fifthly, after the slight slip occurring through forgetfulness, Adam seeks the strength and support of God and says that if Almighty God will not take him up by the hand, he will be one of the lost but after falling into such a serious error than which nothing is more offensive to God, he does not say a single word. Was his nature changed so soon that he became utterly unconscious of sin and, therefore, became a hard-hearted sinner. Sixthly, when after eating of the forbidden fruit, Adam sought the support of God to be saved from such slips in future, such support was granted to him. How could it be then that after finding such support from God, he should have fallen into a far more serious error. Was it thus that the support of God took him by the hand? No more absurd statement could be made. Seventhly, in the *sura* entitled *Ta Ha*, we read with regard to Adam: ثم اجتبه ربه فتاب عليه وهدى "Afterwards his Lord chose him for Himself and turned to him in mercy and guided him in the right path," and this occurred after he had eaten of the forbidden fruit as that *sura* plainly shows. This plainly negatives the occurrence of any similar slip from Adam, to say nothing of such a heinous crime as *shirk*. Moreover if Adam was guilty of *shirk*, then we shall have to suppose that God erred in choosing one for Himself who was to be condemned to eternal punishment for his *shirk*, for it is nowhere stated that it was pardoned. Eighthly, it is plainly written in the Holy Quran: ان الله لا يغفر ان يشرك به ويغفر ما دون ذلك لمن يشاء "Verily God does not forgive that other gods should be set up with Him, and

forgives besides that whatever He wills." This shows that if Adam committed *shirk*, he shall have to suffer for it in hell, an idea which the Holy Quran and the Muslim belief condemn as blasphemous. Ninthly, in the *sura* every prophet is related to have been sent to uproot *shirk*, and the extirpation of *shirk* is aimed at throughout. If the prophets themselves were guilty of *shirk*, the injunctions are meaningless. Tenthly, the verses immediately following lead to the same conclusion. Thus the verses immediately following those quoted above run as follows: ا يشركون مالا يخلق شيئًا وهم يخلقون • ولا يستطيعون لهم نصرا ولا انفسهم ينصرون • قل ادعوا شركاءكم ثم كيدون فلا تنظرون "Do these idolators join those with God who cannot create anything, and are themselves created? And they have no power to help them, (*i.e.*, their worshippers) or to help themselves. Say call on these joint gods of yours then fight with me and give me no delay." These verses show clearly that the *mushriks* spoken of in the above verses are no others than the idolatrous Arabs, and to them and not to Adam and Eve is it said that they may call on their joint gods for their assistance and fight with the Holy Prophet. These verses settle conclusively that the persons spoken of in the previous verses being the same *mushriks* as those spoken of in these are not Adam and Eve, but the enemies of the Holy Prophet. If it be said that in this verse the prayer is addressed to Almighty God which an idol-worshipper could not have done, we say the objection is groundless. The idol-worshippers of Arabia as of most other countries recognised a Being above all their idols, but they thought their idols to be minor deities and as partners with the Supreme Being in the management of the mundane affairs. An exactly parallel verse describing the idol-worshippers occurs in the chapter entitled *Jonah*. "And when after a trouble which befalls them, we cause this people (the *mushrik* enemies of the prophet) to taste of mercy, they make plots against our signs . . . . He it is who letteth you travel by land and by sea, until when you are on board the ships—and they sail away with them with favoring breeze in which they rejoice, there overtakes them a tempestuous gale and the billows come on them from every side, and they are certain that they are encompassed therewith and cannot escape, they call on God, professing unto Him sincere religion: 'If thou rescue us from this, then will we

indeed be of the thankful.' But when we have rescued them, they commit unjust excesses on the earth." Here we have the *mushriks* plainly described as calling on God in time of trouble, as they are also stated to do in the verse under discussion, and vowing that they shall be thankful to Him, as in the former case also, but turning to *shirk* when delivered from the difficulties.

The only thing that remains to be considered is the meaning of the words: هو الذى خلقكم من نفس واحدة وجعل منها زوجها, *i.e.*, "O ye *mushriks*, it is He who has created you from one soul, and of the same has He kind created his mate." The object of this verse is to tell the *mushriks* that their joint-gods are not their creators but that God has created them and their mates, and to point out their mistake that recognising God to be the Creator, they yet join with him other gods in their worship. Now every tribe, every family and every individual has been created from one soul because its descent may be traced to one progenitor near or remote. If in خلقكم "created you" we take the personal pronoun collectively, the نفس واحدة "one soul" will be some progenitor of the Arabs from whom they trace their common descent. But if the personal pronoun كم "you" be taken to refer to every *mushrik* individually, the نفس واحدة "one soul" in that case will be the *mushrik* progenitor of each of them. The expression will then mean "It is God who has created each one of you, O *muskriks*, from a single soul." In both cases the words نفس واحدة or the single soul refer to the idolatrous ancestor or ancestors of the Arabs. The construction is equally favorable to both these interpretations though the context favors the latter. Any how the words do not refer to Adam. The words تعلى الله عما يشركون "High is God exalted above what they join with Him" show clearly that though in the verse only one pair is talked of, yet it is not a particular pair but every pair of *mushrik* parents, the address being generally to all, because the verb يشركون which is in the plural proves clearly that more than two are meant. Every progenitor is a single soul and, therefore, the نفس واحدة refers to that progenitor whether he is the immediate ancestor of every *mushrik* then present, or the common ancestor of all the *mushriks*

addressed by the Holy Prophet. As to the words جعل منها زوجہ it is not true that they mean that the female was created from the male and that, therefore, the description applies to none but Adam from whom Eve was created. This is a wrong notion. In the *Sura Rum*, the Holy Quran says : ومن آیتہ ان خلق لکم من انفسکم ازواجا "And it is among His signs that He created for you from yourselves wives." In this verse it is plainly stated that not only was Eve created from Adam but that the wife of every individual is created from himself, the words من انفسکم being exactly equivalent to منہا, except that the personal pronoun is used in the latter case while in the former the noun itself is used in its plural form, the preposition من *min* (from), which determines the exact significance being the same in both. Both expressions are to be interpreted in one and the same way. The meaning of both these expressions جعل منہا and خلق لکم من انفسکم is that God created the woman of the same nature and kind as the man. With regard to the Holy Prophet, the Holy Quran uses the forms لقد جاء کم رسول من انفسکم and بعث فی الامیین رسولا من انفسہم, *i.e.* "Verily a prophet has come to you from yourselves, *i.e.*, of the same kind and nature as you are" and "God raised among the *Ummis* a prophet from them," the forms من انفسکم and من انفسہم being the same as used with regard to the creation of the woman.

The point is, therefore, conclusively established that in the verse in which according to Mr. Monro it is distinctly stated that Adam was guilty of the grave sin of idolatry," Adam is neither named nor meant at all, and from this it will be seen how honest these Christian Missionaries are in bringing forward objections against Islam. No attention is paid to the words of the Holy Quran which only can be quoted as an authority against the Muslims, but every rejected opinion of some solitary commentator is prized as a valuable instrument wherewith to attack the holy religion of Islam, and great store is set by it though a hundred learned men may have condemned it. Among so many contending sections the Quran is the only authority, and its words can be as easily understood to-day as they were at the time of its revelation. Professing to base their attacks upon the Holy Quran, it is altogether unjust on the part of the Christian missionaries to pick

up some solitary saying or the rejected opinion of a commentator, sayings or opinions not only rejected by all the reliable commentators but strongly contradicted by the Holy Quran itself.

We are amazed to see the boldness of the Christian Missionaries in attributing sins to prophets for which they have not the least ground, but every sin of Jesus narrated in the Gospels is easily overlooked. They falsely charge Adam with having set up gods with God, but they refrain from naming Jesus who according to their books set himself up as a God knowing that he was born in the ordinary way and that he had not the power even to cope with the weakest mortals. Adam was not born of a woman but was created by God in His own Divine image and still he did not make the blasphemous assertion which is put by the Christians into the mouth of the son of a woman. If it be said that Adam lost his divinity by eating of a grain of the forbidden plant, Jesus is liable for the serious charge of having plucked or allowed his disciples to pluck whole corns from a field which being another's property was forbidden to him and his disciples. Moreover Adam did it through forgetfulness, but Jesus intentionally broke the commandment profaning the Sabbath by this illegal deed. Who is really sinful, the man who eats one grain through forgetfulness and thus fails to observe the Divine law or the man who plucks corns intentionally, and thus openly sets at naught the Divine commandments, we leave for Mr. Monro to decide.

NOAH'S PRAYER.

It is not necessary to say more than a few words on this point. Mr. Monro makes the audacious statement that Noah sinned "in having interceded for his son." Unless he can show the commandment of God forbidding Noah to intercede for his son, his statement must be condemned as a daring falsehood. There is not a single verse in the Holy Quran showing that Noah was forbidden to pray for the safety of his son. It should be borne in mind that the verse ولا تخاطبني في الذين ظلموا "And do not address me in respect of the unjust," cannot be quoted by Mr. Monro in support of his assertion, for God had promised to Noah that his

"*ahl*" or family would be saved. What Mr. Monro ought to show is a verse in the Holy Quran that Noah was forbidden to pray for his son, who was one of the family.

On the other hand we read of Noah in *Sura Hud*: ونادى نوح ربه فقال رب ان ابنى من اهلى وان وعدك الحق وانت احكم الحاكمين • قال يٰنوح انه ليس من اهلك انه عمل غير صالح فلا تسئلن ما ليس لك به علم انى اعظك ان تكون من الجهلين • قال رب انى اعوذ بك ان اسئلك ما ليس لى به علم و الا تغفر لى وترحمنى اكن من الخسرين "And Noah called on his Lord and said 'O Lord, my son is of my *ahl* (family), and indeed thy promise (to save my *ahl* or family) is true, and Thou art the most just of judges.' God said, 'O Noah! verily this thy son belongs not to thy family for his deeds are not righteous; ask me not, therefore, of that whereof thou hast not clear knowledge. This I enjoin upon thee lest thou shouldst become one of the ignorant.' He said, 'O my Lord, I seek thy protection that I should ask that of thee whereof I have no knowledge, for unless thou be my support and be merciful to me, I shall be of the lost.'" From these verses it appears that Noah was under the impression that the promise of God being to save his family, his son came within the terms of the promise. But when he saw him drowning, he called upon God with the humble supplication that the Divine promise was to save his *ahl* or family, and that his son was also a member of his family, adding at the same time that he believed the Divine promise to be true and every commandment proceeding from God to be most just. In answer he is told that his son is not of his *ahl* or family but as this would not have been clear, the reason for it is given in the very next words انه عمل غير صالح "for he is not of righteous deeds." This expression Mr. Monro misrepresents as referring to the prayer of Noah. There are several reasons why it cannot be so. A *zamir* or personal pronoun in Arabic requires a noun preceding it for which it stands as a representative. But the noun prayer or question or deed of Noah nowhere occurs in the previous verse and, therefore انه cannot refer to it. Secondly, the use of the first انه makes the matter clear. The expression انه عمل غير صالح follows انه ليس من اهلك immediately. But the personal pronoun in the latter case evidently refers to the son spoken of in the previous verse, and this

decides that انه in the former applies to nothing else. Both personal pronouns are situated alike and are so arranged that they cannot be taken but to refer to the same noun. But as the first personal pronoun refers undoubtedly to Noah's son, the second must refer to him also. Thirdly, Noah had prayed saying "my son is of my family," and, therefore, the mere answer "he is not of thy family," would not have been sufficient unless some reason had been given for it. The promise of God to Noah was that his *ahl* (family) would be saved, but when he saw his son drowning, he naturally cried to God that his son being of his *ahl* or family, should have been included in the promise. But Almighty God told him that his son was not of his family. This statement could not by itself have been a satisfactory answer to Noah's supplication unless he had been told what the reason was for not regarding his son as one of his family, as in the ordinary sense of the term the son was a member of the family. Without this reason the answer is quite unsatisfactory. Hence the words انه ليس من اهلك "he is not of thy family," are immediately followed by انه عمل غير صالح "because he is not of righteous deeds." The sense is quite incomplete without the latter clause.

Mr. Monro has been misled by the form عمل غير صالح "work not righteous" used here, as he might have imagined that a person cannot be referred to as an unrighteous deed. Such an objection proceeds simply from an ignorance of the Arabic language. In Arabic such phrases are frequently used of a person as انه علم وكرم وجود "He is knowledge, and excellence and charity," when his knowledge, excellence and charity are great and abundant. The use of abstract for concrete is common to almost all languages. The Holy Quran itself has an instance of this in the verse ليس البر ان تولوا وجوهكم قبل المشرق والمغرب ولكن البر من آمن بالله واليوم الاخر "Piety is not that you turn your faces towards the east and the west, but *piety is he who* believes in God and the day of judgment. ....." Here the believer in God, &c., and the doer of virtuous deeds instead of being called pious is called piety. Therefore, there is not the least objection in calling a man of unrighteous deeds as an unrighteous deed, but the form is commonly used in Arabic. There is another consideration which determines that this is the true

interpretation of the words. There is a reading of this passage which has *'amila*, the preterite tense instead of the infinitive *amalun*. Now though such readings may not have any weight against the universally adopted reading, still they are of help in casting light upon the meaning of the expressions used in the text. The second reading is in fact explanatory of the meaning of the standard text. Now according to the second reading the meaning is plainly: "He *worked* unrighteous deeds." This meaning assists us in the right interpretation of the words used in the holy Quran. Thus there is not a single consideration in favor of adopting any interpretation but the one we have pointed to above.

The matter of Abraham's prayer for Lot's people casts further light upon this point. Of Abraham it is said يجادلنا فى قوم لوط "He pleaded with us for the people of Lot." Now if Noah's prayer for his son on the basis of a promise which he understood to include his son, is a sin, Abraham's prayer for Lot's people ought to have been condemned by God as a far more serious sin, because not only was Abraham as ignorant in the matter as Noah, and the Divine decree as much against his prayer as in the case of Noah, but he did not also profit by the example of Noah in that case. This story of Abraham's pleading for a sinful people doomed to destruction is related further on in the same *sura* in which *Noah's* prayer for his son is recorded. Thus it appears also from the relation of the two stories in the context that Abraham could not have escaped offending God by his prayer if Noah had given his Divine Master the least offence by his own prayer. The story of Abraham's prayer, therefore, explains the nature of Noah's prayer. Let us, therefore, see what is the Divine judgment upon Abraham's prayer. It is stated يجادلنا فى قوم لوط ان ابراهيم لحليم واه منيب ۝ يا ابراهيم اعرض عن هذا "Abraham pleaded with us for the people of Lot, for he was kind-hearted and pitiful and one who turned to God. O Abraham, desist from this." As Noah was told not to pray for his son, so is Abraham told not to pray for Lot's people. It has been truly said of the Holy Quran that some parts of it are explanatory of others. In fact the story of Abraham is explanatory of the story of Noah's prayer. There is not the slightest shadow of reason that Noah should have been called an unrighteous man for the same deed for which

Abraham while coming after Noah is praised and extolled. If such a prayer was in Abraham a sign of kind-heartedness, it was equally so in Noah. The fact is that only the describing words are different while the purport is the same in both cases. Like Noah, Abraham has been enjoined not to pray as the people prayed for, do not deserve mercy on account of their unrighteous deeds. As Abraham is described as one turning to God, so of Noah it is related that he sought the support and protection of God saying اني اعوذ بک and لا تغفرلی و ترحمنی "O Lord ! I seek thy protection," and "be thou my support and be thou merciful to me." Thus there is not a single word to show that Noah was sinful in praying to God for the safety of his son. The words "O my Lord ! I seek thy protection that I should ask that of thee whereof I have no knowledge, for unless thou be my support and be merciful to me, I shall be of the lost," do not lend any support to the sweeping charges of Mr. Monro. We admit that prophets and non-prophets equally stand in need of the support and protection of God, and anyone who does not seek such support or whom such support is not granted, is lost. It is for this reason that the Holy Prophet prayed saying رب لا تکلنی الی نفسی طرفة عین 'O Lord, do thou not leave me to myself for the twinkling of an eye.' Since such support and protection was granted to Noah, therefore, Almighty God says of him in the next verse یٰنوح اهبط بسلم منا و برکت علیک "O Noah, debark with peace from us and with blessings on thee." Who has ever heard of sins rewarded with peace and blessings from God.

It is not however the only surprising thing about these Christian Missionaries that the prophets of God are unjustly charged by them with sins, but what is still more wonderful is that the man whom they take for their God stands condemned for far more serious sins on the authority of their Gospels. For instance, Noah is alleged to have sinned in praying to God for his son, which it is alleged was an act in violation of the commandments of God. We have disproved this charge and shown clearly that no commandment to Noah is contained in any verse of the Holy Quran requiring him not to pray for his son, and that nowhere is this deed called sinful. But let us examine the conduct of Jesus in a similar matter. Almighty God had sent him into the world to die on the

cross and he was aware of this Divine commandment. To have prayed to be saved from such a death would, therefore, be the greatest sin on his part. Yet the Gospels report that he actually prayed to be saved and spent a whole night in violation of the Divine commandment, and that he was "sorrowful unto death" when the time came for the fulfilment of the asserted Divine purpose. The prayer of Jesus was, therefore, in violation of the Divine commandment which required him to die on the cross. It is really the sin of Jesus according to the Gospels with which the prophet Noah is falsely charged. How Jesus is not sinful according to the Gospels in having prayed to God against His commandment, and how Noah is sinful according to the Quran, are questions which we would like to see answered together by Mr. Monro.

JONAH'S FLIGHT.

Of this prophet Mr. Monro says that he "ran away *from God*" and "*disobeyed the commandment of God.*" (Italics are ours). For these two statements he cites the Holy Quran as his authority. The quotations from the Holy Book which we give further on, will clearly show that Jonah's running away *from God*, and *disobeying the commandment of God* are monstrous falsehoods. Mr. Monro cannot quote a single word from the Holy Quran showing that Jonah ran away from God or that he disobeyed the commandment of God. We take first the verses in the chapter entitled "the Prophets." The subject-matter of this chapter is as its title denotes of particular importance with reference to prophets. In the beginning attention is called to the fact how the prophets are scorned, laughed at and abused by the people to whom they are sent, and this is followed by a description in general terms of the fate of those who reject and abuse the prophets. We have then a statement showing the relation of prophets to God and clearly negativing the existence of sin in their case. Thus they are spoken of as عباد مكرمون لا يسبقونه بالقول وهم بامره يعملون "Honored servants of God who speak not till He has spoken and at His bidding do they act." These words plainly deny the possibility of sin on the part of the prophets. Their very nature is described to be such that they cannot intend to go against the Divine will. No sensible person could entertain

be immediately followed by an account showing their disobedience to the commandments of God. The fact is that wherever the Holy Quran makes a general statement, it cites also examples illustrative of it. A study of the dealings of God with the prophets as narrated in this very *sura* further on shows clearly the truth of this statement. It is in this connection too that the story of Jonah is related. A few verses are devoted to the condition of the unbelievers and then certain prophets are mentioned by name. Of each prophet the excellence is described, and then it is stated how Almighty God delivered them on account of their near access to and close connection with Him from difficulties in which they were involved either by a heavenly decree or by the persecutions and cruelties of their enemies. First of all Abraham is mentioned and of him it is said: ولقد آتينا ابراهيم رشده من قبل "And we gave unto Abraham direction and excellence before thee." It is then described how he incurred the displeasure and wrath of his people by breaking their images in obedience to the Divine will, and lastly it is stated that he was delivered (ونجيناه "And we delivered him") from every difficulty into which his enemies intended to involve him. Of his posterity Isaac and Jacob are then mentioned by name and of them it is related: وكلا جعلنا صلحين وجعلنهم ائمة يهدون بامرنا واوحينا اليهم فعل الخيرات "And we made them righteous. We also made them models who should guide others in the commandments of God and we inspired them to do good deeds only." Then comes Lot of whom it is said that "We gave him wisdom and knowledge" ونجيناه من القرية التى كانت تعمل الخبائث "And we rescued him from the city which wrought evil deeds." Then Noah is spoken of and it is said of him فاستجبنا له فنجيناه واهله من الكرب العظيم "We heard him and delivered him and his family from the great calamity." Then David and Solomon are mentioned and it is said: "On both of them we bestowed wisdom and knowledge." Job follows and is thus spoken of: فاستجبنا له فكشفنا ما به من ضر "We heared him and removed the burden of woes from him." Then we have Ismail, Idris and Zulkifl, "all steadfast in patience —and we caused them to enter into our mercy, because they were truly of the righteous." Here follows the story of Zunnun or Jonah in the following words: وذا النون اذ ذهب مغاضبا فظن ان لن نقدر

عليه فنا دى فى الظلمت ان لااله الا انت سبحنک انى كنت من الظلمين فا ستجبنا له ونجينه من الغم وكذ لک ننجى المو منين

"And we gave direction and excellence to Zunnun also when he went away in anger and thought that we would not straiten him or bring him into distress, but (when distress came upon him) he cried to us in the darkness (of the whale's belly), (as other prophets cried to God in distress), saying 'There is no God but Thou. Thou art free from every defect, but I am weak and in great distress.' So we heard him and delivered him from distress and thus do we deliver the true believers in us." Zannun is in the objective case and, therefore, a verb governing it is understood before it as it is also understood before the names of the other prophets mentioned also in the objective case, such as Lot, David, Solomon, Job, Ishmael, Idris and Zulkifl; and this verb is evidently the one mentioned before the name of the first prophet named, *i.e.*, Abraham. We have, therefore, expressed the significance of this verb in the translation. The last verse makes it quite clear that the distress which befell Jonah was of the same nature as befell other prophets who were the true believers in, God, and that his prayer was heard and that he was delivered in the same manner as the other prophets already described. From the above abstract of the subject-matter, it is further clear that in this *sura* the prophets named are mostly described to have been involved in distress and difficulties, and that when they cried to God, their prayers were heard and they were delivered from the difficulties. It is further clear that the difficulties in which the prophets were involved were not brought about by their sins. What is repeated in the *sura* again and again is how every prophet bore patiently all the troubles and difficulties which were brought upon him either by his enemies or by a heavenly decree, how he cried to God and sought His assistance only, when abandoned by the whole world, and how at last he was by the grace of God and with His helping hand delivered from all those difficulties which at one time seemed quite insurmountable. It is for this reason that in this *sura* we read almost of every prophet the words نجينه *i. e.*, "we delivered him." The same words occur of Jonah, and it is further asserted كذ لک ننجى المو منين "In this manner we deliver all the faithful." These words conclusively show that the difficulties and deliverance of Jonah were exactly of the same nature as those of the prophets previously described.

Let us now take the words of the verses quoted above with regard to Jonah. It is first of all stated that "we gave direction and excellence to Jonah when he went away in anger." The Holy Quran does not state against whom he was in anger. This much at any rate is certain that he could not be in anger against God. For it is clearly stated that God gave him direction and excellence when he went away in anger. Had he been in anger against God, it ought to have been plainly stated that he was in error and under the wrath of God when he went away in anger. Moreover it is nothing but folly or dishonesty to make such an absurd supposition in the case of a prophet, especially when we are told in the same chapter that the prophets of God are honored servants who do not speak until He has bidden them tos peak and do not act until He has bidden them to act. Nor is it necessary for us to go into details as to the person against whom he was in anger. The Holy Quran does not describe it anywhere and we need not waste time on what the Word of God has thought unnecessary to state. It may however be mentioned here that according to a story related on the authority of Ibn-i-Abbas, the king of the country was the person against whom the prophet Jonah was in anger, whereas some hold that he was in anger against his own people to whom he had been preaching and by whom he was rejected. Both suppositions make the story accord with the narratives of other prophets related in the same chapter as well as with the general description of the prophets to which attention has been called above.

Then follow the words فظن ان لن نقدر عليه and it is here that Mr. Monro and his friends have either stumbled or intentionally made a misrepresentation. The true interpretation of these words has been given above. Of those who have thought the translation of this expression to be "he thought that we had no power over him," the author of the famous Arabic lexicon, the Lisan-ul-Arab, says (Vol. VI. p. 386): ولا يتاول مثله الا الجاهل بكلام العرب ولغاتها "No one interprets it in this manner except he who is quite ignorant of the Arabic language and of its lexicography." The same lexicographer says: "The true meaning of the expression is 'he thought that we would not ordain for him any distress,' or 'that we would not bring upon him any distress' and both these interpretations of the words used are well-known in the Arabic language." Other instances of the latter use of the word abound in the Holy Quran. Thus we read:

ومن قدر عليه رزقه and الله يبسط الرزق لمن يشاء من عباده ويقدر
If any one made an error in interpreting this word on account of his ignorance of the Arabic language, the preponderating weight of authority has conclusively decided the question and exposed the error. It is folly on the part of the Christian Missionaries to stick to the wrong translation, especially when the error has been so fully exposed from the very earliest times.

The expression that remains to be considered is: لا اله الا انت سبحنک انی کنت من الظلمین. The word ظلم *zulm* will be discussed at full length later on. We need only state here that in these words the prophet compares the human weakness and defects to the power and perfection of God. He says of God سبحنک "Thou art perfect and free from every defect." Against this perfection and power of God, he describes his own condition as a human being suffering under great distresses and difficulties. He ascribes power to God and weakness to himself and thus makes a supplication for the power of God to take him by the hand and deliver him from the dire distress into which he has fallen. He ascribes perfection to God and against this he puts the defectiveness of his own soul and thus prays for the Divine perfection to make up for the natural defects. The absolute perfection of Divinity and the utter weakness and helplessness of human nature, are here placed side by side by the prophet. It is for this reason that the Holy Prophet said, as is reported in trustworthy traditions, that a Muslim who under the greatest difficulties and hardest pressure prays to God in the words of the Prophet Jonas, would have his difficulties removed. The prayer is, therefore, here described as being one for seeking deliverance from difficulties and not for seeking pardon for sins. This tradition settles the meaning of this prayer and shows conclusively that the word ظلم in this case refers to the distress which had befallen the prophet and not to sins. There is no mention of sin before or after, and the use of this prayer is stated by the Holy Prophet himself to be the seeking of deliverance from difficulties. The words of the tradition are: ما دعا بها عبد مسلم قط وهو مكروب الا استجاب الله دعاءه "Never shall a Muslim in difficulties pray to God in this manner but God shall accept his prayer." The word ظالم therefore, denotes in this case one in

great distress, for unless it were so the prayer would be meaningless in the mouth of a distressed person, nor would it have to do anything with the removal of distress or difficulties.

The concluding words of the verses make the matter still more clear. فاستجبنا له ونجيناه من الغم "So we accepted his prayer and delivered him from distress." Here a prayer is spoken of as having been accepted and the consequence of the acceptance of the prayer is stated to be the deliverance of Jonah, while further on such deliverance is promised to all the faithful who resort to prayer. From this it is clear that Jonah's prayer was for deliverance from the distress which had fallen upon him. But the only prayer recorded the one we have considered in the previous paragraph, and in that prayer the only word expressive of Jonah's state is ظالم. It is, therefore, from this state that he prayed to God to be delivered. But the acceptance of this prayer shows that this was a state of distress and heavy afflictions and, therefore, we are bound to give the word ظالم, the significance "one under heavy afflictions." So far, therefore, we have no proof of the alleged running away from God, of disobedience to the commandments of God, of the admission of sinfulness and of being unjust.

Let us now take the verses of the *Sura Safat*. Here we have وان يونس لمن المرسلين اذ ابق الى الفلك المشحون فساهم فكان من المدحضين فالتقمه الحوت وهو مليم فلولا انه كان من المسبحين للبث في بطنه "And Jonas also was one of the apostles. Remember how he fled to the laden ship, and lots were cast and he was doomed; and the fish swallowed him while he was considered blameworthy. But had he not been one of those who declare the sanctity of God, he would have remained in its belly." In this *sura* too we read how Almighty God delivered His chosen prophets from the hands of their enemies; how Noah, then Abraham, then Moses, and Aaron, then Elias, then Lot were helped by God in time of need because they trusted in God and were faithful to Him under the greatest trials and worked righteous deeds, for it is said: انا كذلك نجزي المحسنين انه من عبادنا المومنين "Verily in this manner we reward the doers of righteousness, for he (the prophet spoken of) was of our servants who remain faithful to us (under the severest afflictions

and trials)." Here follows an account of Jonas and it is commenced in the laudable terms "Verily Jonas also was one of those whom we selected as prophets." The trial to which he was subjected like Abraham, Noah, Moses, Lot, &c., is then described. The starting point of this trial is his running away to a laden ship. The supposition that he ran away from God is the height of absurdity. Had this been intended the previous verse instead of saying "Jonah also was one of our honored prophets," ought to have said "Jonah also was one of the *mujrims* or sinners" for he ran away from God. It has already been stated in commenting upon the verses of the *Sura Ambia* that it was the king or the people against whom he was in anger, and it was from them that he ran away. After Jonah entered the ship, greater difficulties encompassed him. The lot was cast upon him and he was thrown into the river. He was considered blameworthy by the crew, but he was not blameworthy in the sight of God, therefore, he was saved. Had he been blameworthy in the sight of God as he was apparently taken to be, he would have been drowned when cast into the river and Almighty God would not have come to his succour, because He Himself says that if he had not been a مسبح (a glorifier of God) and had really been ملیم (blameworthy) he would have been drowned. But Almighty God Himself clears him of all charges by saying that he was one of those who always glorified God and, therefore, not being actually blameworthy as the crew had thought him to be, he was saved from destruction which he would certainly have met if he had displeased God by disobeying His commandments. But since he was true and faithful to God like the prophets who were delivered before him, therefore he was saved by God when no hope of his life was left.

It is clear from all this that Jonas never ran away from God, but an incident is related of Jesus in the Gospels which shows that Jesus ran away from God. The Gospels say that when the time had come for the fulfilment of the Divine purpose, Jesus hid himself in a garden. Now hiding himself from the Jews, meant really running away from God because the Jews were at that time the agents for the fulfilment of the Divine purpose according to the Gospels. But Jesus had not the courage to offer himself in obedience to the alleged Divine commandment to get himself cruci-

fied, and the Jews were obliged to hire one of his dearest apostles to find him out. We wish to know what the Christians have to say in explanation of Jesus' running away from God, and hiding himself from Him.

MOSES' KILLING A MAN.

Mr. Monro charges Moses with the grave sin of culpable homicide and quotes the *Sura Qasas* as his authority for the charge. Regarding this killing the following account is given in the *sura*: "And when he (Moses) had reached his age of strength and had become a man, we bestowed on him wisdom and knowledge, for thus do we reward the righteous." Here Moses is clearly described as a righteous man upon whom wisdom and knowledge were bestowed by God because of his righteousness. "And he entered the city at the time of neglect on the part of its people; and found therein two men fighting: the one of his own party and the other of his enemies. And he who was of his own party cried out to Moses for help against his enemy," evidently because the enemy was about to vanquish him "and Moses" seeing his helpless state "struck the enemy with his fist, and he was dead." Moses said: 'This punishment is on account of the works of Satan (referring to the person killed) for he is an enemy, a manifest misleader.' He said 'O Lord, I have thrown myself into a trial (for he knew that if his enemies got information, he would be murdered), therefore, protect me (from my enemies), so God protected him, for He is the protecting and the merciful. Moses said: 'my Lord! because thou hast shown me this grace, I will by no means be ever the helper of the wicked.' And in the city at morn he was full of fear, casting glances round him as if apprehensive of danger; when lo! the man whom he had helped the day before, cried out to him again for help. Moses said to him, 'Verily thou art evidently a quarrelsome person.' Then when Moses was about to lay hands on him who was their common foe, the other said: 'O Moses dost thou desire to slay me as thou didst slay a man yesterday.'"

In this story several points should be particularly noted. The story starts with a description of Moses which rebuts every pre-

sumption of sin against him. Moses was granted wisdom and knowledge because of his great righteousness. This is just the point which the Christian Missionaries would leave out of consideration and this is exactly what Mr. Monro has done. The fact is that this expression determines the tenor of the whole story, and, therefore, Mr. Monro would have lost his point by stating it. Almighty God begins the story of Moses as a man great in righteousness which was so pleasing in the sight of God that He showered upon him His gracious gifts of deep wisdom and perfect knowledge. Imagine this description followed by the statement that he committed culpable homicide one morning, then repented of it, and the next morning attempted to kill another man and would have succeeded in his attempt had it not been for the noise made by the latter! Could any thing more absurd be conceived? We may exemplify this by the case of a lecturer on total abstinence from strong liquors holding out to the audience for imitation the example of a total abstainer who was everywhere praised for his total abstinence and then adding the little anecdote that he was seen by him one evening lying in the street intoxicated and that having repented in the night in his presence, he was seen the next evening going into a wine-shop. Just imagine the absurdity of this and reflect if the Christian Missionaries are not guilty of a greater absurdity in interpreting the verses of the Holy Quran. Moses is held out at first as an exemplar in virtue to the faithful, and is then praised for his great righteousness with which Almighty God was so pleased as to reward him with wisdom and knowledge. What a folly to suppose that in the very next verse he is described as a ruthless man-slayer who used to murder innocent people.

Another point worth noting is that after praying to God for protection and the Divine promise that he shall be protected, Moses says: رب بما انعمت علي فلن اكون ظهيرا للمجرمين *i.e.*, "O my Lord, on account of what thou hast bestowed upon me, I will never be the helper of the wicked." It cannot be asserted, therefore, that Moses committed a sin in helping the Israelite. In helping him, Moses acted either rightly or wrongly; if he acted rightly, the objection falls, and if wrongly, he must have been a helper of the wicked. But this Almighty God informs us immediately he was not and, therefore, the latter supposition is wrong. Even if this promise of Moses be supposed for the sake of argument to have been made after this event,

still it cannot follow that in helping the Israelite Moses was not acting in the right. It cannot be imagined that after making such a solemn promise, Moses would again have dared to do the same act the next morning. But the story tells us that on the next day he found the same Israelite again fighting with another Egyptian and on his appeal was again about to help him but a certain circumstance hindered him. Had Moses considered himself guilty of a sinful deed in helping the Israelite on the first occasion, he could not have recurred to the same act so soon after making the solemn promise that he would never help the guilty. That Moses on the second occasion was acting unjustly is strongly contradictad by the words فلن اكون ظهيرا للمجرمين "I shall never be the helper of the wicked." But since the nature of his act on the first occasion was exactly the same as of that on the second, it follows as a necessary conclusion that his first act also was not considered by himself or by Almighty God as an unjust act. The futility of the Christian objection is evident from this.

Another consideration showing that Moses did not consider himself as acting unjustly in helping the Israelite follows from his prayer when flying to Madian in which he says: رب نجنى من القوم الظلمين "O Lord, deliver me from the unjust people." Here Moses plainly describes his enemies as unjust which he could not have done if he had considered himself as acting unjustly in the matter. If Moses knew that he was unjust in killing the man, he could not have described his enemies as unjust in bringing the guilty person to law. "A soul for a soul" was the law which Moses himself preached, and how could he have called the people unjust who sought to enforce a law which he regarded as just. His description of his enemies as an unjust people on account of their seeking his life, shows clearly that he considered himself to be in the right in having given a blow to the Egyptian. He believed that the infliction of any punishment upon him was unjust and, therefore, he must have believed that his own act which did not justly deserve any punishment was a just act and not a sin in the sight of God. Further on when Moses comes to the good old man's house in Madian and relates the story of his having killed an Egyptian and of his flight from fear of the authorities, the master of the house also regards the Egyptians and not Moses as unjust and says to him: لا تخف نجوت من القوم الظلمين "Fear not, thou hast been delivered from the *unjust* people." It is

thus clear that throughout the story Almighty God describes those as unjust who sought to punish Moses and since the punishment is regarded as unjust, the act itself which was sought to be punished, must be regarded as just.

On another occasion Moses talking to Almighty God says: ولهم علي ذنب "And *they* consider me as having committed a sin." From this too it is clear that Moses did not consider himself sinful *in the sight of God*, for he says to God not that he is sinful in His sight but that the Egyptians consider him to have committed a sin, and we have already shown that in this Moses regarded them unjust.

The words of Moses هذا من عمل الشيطان "This is owing to Satanic works," further support the same conclusion. When Moses sees the Egyptian dying, he at once attributes his death to his own Satanic works in having been the aggressor. To take these words as referring to Moses is so simple an absurdity that there is hardly any need to point it out. Every consideration goes against it as we have already seen and the context shows clearly that Moses is referring to the Satanic works of the Egyptian. As regards the words ظلمت نفسي it is easy to see that Moses is not referring to an unjust act on his own part, for as already shown he considers the steps taken against him by the Egyptians as unjust and, therefore, he could not for a moment have thought himself as acting unjustly in the matter. The words simply refer to the danger into which he had thrown his life, for he knew that the Egyptians being already his enemies were only seeking for a pretence to lay their hands on him. This consciousness of danger to his life led him to seek the protection of God, for being a righteous man he knew that Almighty God was his only strength and support and his real protector. This prayer was accepted and Moses was told he would be protected and that he would not fall into the hands of the Egyptians. It was in accordance with this Divine promise of protection that as soon as the matter became known and the authorities were considering plans for his arrest and murder, Almighty God informed Moses to escape to Madian and thus saved his life.

That this is the true interpretation of the verse is not only evident from the above considerations, but the story as narrated in other places in the Holy Quran leads to the same conclusion. Thus in the *Sura Ta ha*, Almighty God tells Moses how He saved his life on more

occasions than one. He first states how when a new-born baby his life was saved only by Providence, and then says وقتلت نفسا فنجينک من الغم "And thou didst murder a man and we delivered thee from great anxiety." That this anxiety was for his own life which was exposed to great danger cannot be doubted. Reading this verse along with the verse in *Sura Qasas*, it is evident that the anxiety expressed by Moses in the words انی ظلمت نفسی فا غفر لی is the same anxiety for deliverance of which he is reminded in the *Sura Ta ha*. Had the murder of the Egyptian been a sin in the sight of God, and had such been the purport of the words in the *Sura Qasas* already quoted, Almighty God ought to have told Moses somewhere how he sinned in murdering the Egyptian and how his sin was pardoned when he showed anxiety for it. On the other hand, Almighty God only relates the favor of saving his life. Moreover there ought to have been some mention of Moses' anxiety for his sin anywhere else in the Holy Quran, for the story is frequently repeated. But instead of finding any expression of such anxiety on the part of Moses, we always read that it was the anxiety for his life which troubled Moses so much so that even after being commanded to go to Pharoah, he humbly submitted انی قتلت منهم نفسا فا خا ف ان یقتلو ن "Of their people I killed a man and I fear lest they should murder me." Doubtless then the anxiety expressed in ظلمت نفسی refers to the danger to his life which is so frequently mentioned in the Holy Quran, and the protection there promised is a protection from the evil designs of his enemies and not a protection from the punishment of sin. What actually took place after this event shows the truth of this statement, for we find mention of the safety of life being granted to Moses on other occasions in the Holy Quran, and in the midst of his bitterest enemies he was saved in a miraculous way.

So far as the Holy Quran is concerned, Moses, it will be seen from the above, cannot be considered as guilty of a sin. Although it is not necessary for us to do so, we may also consider here the nature of the act done by Moses and how he justified himself in doing it and considering the people unjust who sought to punish him for it. The fact is that the Israelites were living in hard bondage to the Egyptians. They were not only considered as slaves but were treated with far greater rigor and were obliged to perform the meanest offices for their cruel masters. This fact is pointed out by the Holy Quran as well as

Exodus. It is easy to see that in this degraded condition their lives could not be safe against the tyranny of their masters. The ancient rules of society did not allow of the proper remedy when a slave was put to death. Add to this the rigor of the Egyptians against their Israelite bondmen and the abject condition in which the latter were, and it is easy to see how easily an Egyptian could have murdered an Israelite without the law being set in motion against him when the authorities themselves winked at the murder of the poor Hebrews. Consider now the Egypt ian and the Israelite fighting, and it is easy to see that the life of the poor Israelite slave was at the mercy of his cruel master. Had Moses not come in for his help, he would surely have fallen a victim to the rage of the Egyptian. When quite helpless against the cruel foe, he sought the assistance of Moses as an oppressed party. The word سنغا ثه) shows clearly that the Israelite was the oppressed party and had it not been for the intervention of Moses, he would certainly have been killed. What Moses did under the circumstances was to strike the enemy with his fist, a blow by no means intended to cause death but only to release the party oppressed. Death, therefore, was accidental because it does not usually occur on striking a man with the fist. But even if it had been intentional, Moses would have been justified, because if he had not interfered the Israelite would have been killed. What he did, therefore, was to save the life of a man who was an oppressed party. It is for this reason that we find Moses immediately afterwards saying: فلن اكون ظهيرا للمجرمين "I will by no means be a helper of the wicked oppressors." This statement of Moses shows clearly that he was at the time perfectly conscious of his having helped the oppressed party. It was for this reason too that the next morning when he saw the same Israelite again being oppressed by another Egyptian and calling to him aloud for help, he was ready to offer him again his helping hand. By calling him a *ghawi* Moses did not mean that he was the oppressor at that time for had such been his meaning he would not have proceeded to help him. By calling him غوی he simply meant that he was quarrelsome and to warn him that he should refrain from picking up quarrels with men who treated him so harshly. It is, therefore, clear that Moses was defending the life of an oppressed person when accidently the oppressor met with his death. He was, therefore, not guilty of murder because his act was justified and necessary to save the life of

an innocent man, but he feared the injustice of the Egyptians because they did not place the same value upon the lives of the Israelites as upon those of their own countrymen. But with Moses, the prophet of God, the life of an Israelite had the same value as that of an Egyptian.

CHARGE OF IDOLATRY AGAINST AARON.

Mr. Monro charges Aaron with idolatry and refers to *Sura Al-Araf*, verse 150, as his authority for the charge. The verse with its translation showing Mr. Monro's dishonesty in attacking the prophets of God, is given below: ولما رجع موسى الى قومه غضبا ن اسفا قال بئسما خلفتمو نى من بعد ى اعجلتم امر ربكم والقى الالواح واخذ برا س اخيه يجره اليه قال ابن ام ان القوم استضعفو نى وكا د وا يقتلو ننى فلا تشمت بى الاعدا ء ولا تجعلنى مع القو م الظلمين "And when Moses returned to his people wrathful and angered against them, he said: 'Evil is it that you have done behind my back after my departure. Would you hasten on the judgment of your Lord to punish you.' And he threw down the tables, and seized his brother Aaron by the head and dragged him to him. 'Son of my mother,' said Aaron, 'verily *the people thought me weak and had well-nigh slain me*. Make not then my enemies to rejoice over me, *and place me not among the doers of evil.*'" The italics should be particularly noted. We wonder which word in the whole of this verse lends any support to Mr. Monro's charge of idolatry against Aaron. It was the people as the verse plainly says against whom Moses was in wrath on account of their worship of the calf and it was the people to whom the words "Evil is it that you have done after my departure" were addressed. Of this same people Aaron says: "The people thought me weak and had well-nigh slain me," and this shows clearly that Aaron himself was not included in them. On the other hand, his own life was in danger on account of the opposition of his teaching to the idol-worship of the people. Aaron, therefore, was not one of those who worshipped the calf. On the other hand he preached against it and, therefore, his very life was in danger. This is very clearly stated in *Sura Taha*: ولقد قال لهم هرون من قبل يقوم انما فتنتم به وان ربكم الرحمن فاتبعونى واطيعوا امرى "And verily Aaron had before said to them: 'O my people, by this calf you are only proved, and verily your Lord is the

Merciful God: follow me, therefore, and obey my bidding.'" Is it honest to charge a prophet with idolatry in a matter in which he strongly preaches against idolatry and enjoins his people to worship the one true God. This point is further cleared by the plain statement of Aaron saying: "Place me not among the doers of evil," in the verse referred to by Mr. Monro himself. There is not a single word to show that Aaron joined in the worship of the calf, but there are plain words clearing him of the charge of participation in the evil deed and showing that he all the while preached against idol-worship and was for this very reason about to lose his life. We have already shown in commenting upon the charge of *shirk* against Adam that it is the height of absurdity to attribute such a grave crime to any prophet of God, and the Holy Quran condemns such assertions in plain words, and, therefore, there is no need to dwell upon this subject here. To assert that because Moses asks pardon for his brother when he says: رب اغفر لی ولاخی and, therefore, Aaron must have been guilty of idolatry is another absurdity. There is not a single word to show that Aaron joined in the worship of the calf and the Holy Quran makes *shirk* as the greatest sin and one which shall never be forgiven. *Istighfar* moreover does not mean only a prayer for the pardon of sins but a prayer for the protection and the strength and support of God. There is a clear indication here that Moses was not praying to God to pardon Aaron's sin, for his prayer is couched in the same terms regarding Aaron as for himself. Thus he says: رب اغفرلی ولاخی "O Lord, I seek thy *maghfirat* for myself and my brother." Evidently Moses did not consider himself as having participated in the worship of the calf. His *istighfar* for his brother is of the same nature as that for himself and it does not refer to the commission of a sin. What a strange explanation that *istighfar* in the sense of asking pardon for sins was necessary for Moses and Aaron who did not join in the worship of the calf, but that it was not necessary for the people who went astray and worshipped the calf!

CHARGE AGAINST ABRAHAM.

Mr. Monro charges Abraham with having committed "three sins of lying," but it is really Mr. Monro who lies, for Abraham, says the Quran, never lied. For this false allegation he does not quote the

Holy Quran but has recourse to tradition. We do not think he is ignorant of the value attached to traditions by the Muslims. No tradition is reliable according to Muslim belief which contradicts the Holy Quran. Now the Quran speaks of Abraham in plain terms as صدیقا نبیا "Most truthful prophet." The Holy Quran is the pure word of God whereas in tradition a great deal of fictitious narrative is mixed. Therefore, if the Holy Quran describes Abraham as one who never lied, a tradition, the only authority for which is the word of a narrator, must be condemned as false which ascribes lying to a "most truthful" prophet of God. No Muslim can entertain the idea for a moment that God lied in describing Abraham as "most truthful," but many traditions are rejected as being falsely attributed to the Prophet of God and every tradition must be condemned as such which is against the Holy Quran. Moreover in admitting the tradition as true, we must regard Abraham as one who lied, while in rejecting it, we shall have only to look upon the narrator as one who lied. The meaning of *istighfar* has already heen explained on several occasions and we need not recur to it here. The Christians however shall have to think of some remedy for excluding Jesus from among the faithful for all of whom Abraham's prayer of *istighfar* is here addressed to God.

The three matters in respect of which Abraham is said to have lied, may here be considered though it is not necessary for us to do so. It is alleged that Abraham lied in saying انی سقیم "I am sick," but no evidence is produced to show the falsity of this statement. If a man says he is sick, none of us would doubt it; why is then the word of Abraham supposed to be untrue. The next occasion on which Abraham is falsely charged to have spoken a lie is that on which he uttered the words بل فعله صلی ق کبیرهم هذا These words he spoke in reply to a question from the idol-worshippers if he had broken their images. However these words may be construed, Abraham cannot be said to have told alie on this occasion. Seven different interpretations are given by Razi as having been adopted by one or other of the great Muslim commentators. One thing may be easily seen. In the Holy Quran there is a pause after بل فعله which shows that the subject of the verb does not go beyond the pause. The meaning is clearly this, "Some doer did it; here is the greatest among them (still unbroken)." Even if کبیرهم be taken as the subject of the verb فعله, though the pause

does not allow it, still it cannot be called a lie on the part of Abraham for he only adopted an expression to direct the attention of the idolators to their inconsistency in regarding their idols as having powers, and in regarding the greatest among them as void of power to break the minor ones. كبيرهم may also refer to God, for it was as His agent that Abraham acted. He never tried to conceal that he had broken the images. Addressing the whole assembly of the idolators, he had said in plain words تاللہ لاکیدن اصنامکم "By God I will most certainly fight a fight with your idols," which plainly meant that he would break them. The form of expression used by Abraham is very forcible and leaves no doubt as to his purpose. How could he think then of hiding the fact of his having broken them. The third occasion is not related in the Holy Quran. It relates to Abraham's statement that Sarah was his sister. As a matter of fact there is no untruth in this statement for in Genesis 20 : 12, Abraham plainly states : "And yet indeed she is my sister; she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother." Even Abimelech is made to say afterwards to Sarah "I have given unto thy brother," meaning Abraham. Therefore Abraham did not lie when he said that Sarah was his sister.

It is clear from this that Abraham never told a lie and the Holy Quran condemns such charges as monstrous falsehoods by describing Abraham as a "most truthful" prophet. But there are several lies related in the Gospels concerning Jesus, and it is the duty of Mr. Monro and his brethren to show how the sinlessness of Jesus can be reconciled with the truth of the Gospels. If Jesus did not commit the sin of lying, the Gospels tell a lie; but if the Gospels are regarded as true narratives, Jesus cannot be acquitted of the charge. As an instance of this we refer Mr. Monro to Matt. 23: 43 where Jesus says to the thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." He knew that he was going to hell that evening and told the thief, simply to gain one more notorious adherent, that he was going to heaven and would take him with him. In John 20 : 17, he plainly says : "I am not yet ascended to my father." Therefore according to the Gospels he lied in making the first statement. Another instance in which the truthfulness of the Gospels cannot be reconciled with that of Jesus is furnished in Matt. 16 : 28, where Jesus is made to say : "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom." The whole world knows this to be a lie and

the Christian Missionaries are at liberty to attribute this manifest lie either to Jesus or to the Gospels. They need not give their verdict in haste but may deeply reflect over the position they intend to take in the matter and have the choice which is more suitable. In another case Jesus told his disciples that they would sit on twelve thrones and Judas was one of those whom he addressed (Matt. 19: 28). The Gospels also tell us that Jesus knew that Judas would betray him. Therefore if the Gospel narrative is taken as correct, it cannot be doubted that Jesus lied. Many other instances can be quoted from the Gospels, but at present these three would suffice, and if Mr Monro is able to handle them with the same cleverness with which he attacks the prophets of God, we shall furnish him with more material for the exercise of his critical faculty. We hope he will show us his readiness to discuss the most important question of the sinlessness of Jesus on the basis of the Gospels.

To be continued.

Are all Religions from God?

THE following letter was written by the Promised Messiah in answer to an old Hindu friend who wrote to him that all religions were from God and that salvation not being the monoply of any particular religion, a man could attain to it by following any religion. The letter runs thus:—

It has given me much pleasure to learn that you have an interest in the all-important question of religion. In fact since this world is like an inn and its inhabitants only travellers who must go back to their real home sooner or later, it is the duty of every one of us to give the deepest consideration to the questions of religion and belief. It is also our duty that if a religion is proved to our satisfaction to be from God and a path is known to us as the path of the pleasure of God, we should choose that religion and walk in that path fearless of every disgrace and dishonor and regardless of the ties of close relationship or of the attractions of kindred and wealth. In this manner did the righteous always act and in the cause of truth they bore all sorts of sufferings and persecutions.

In the world we witness false beliefs prevailing along with true ones and wicked deeds practised along with good ones. But the righteous should shun every falsehood and evil. For instance, it is alleged by a certain section of the Hindu community that the Vedas inculcate the doctrine that in case a wife bears no offspring for some years after marriage or gives birth only to female children, her husband should invite a stranger to have carnal knowledge of her, and that this process should be continued until the wife bears eleven male children from the stranger's seed. The followers of the Sakat mat who also trace their religious principles to the Vedas have their religious festivals characterized by horrible scenes of incest and adultery, and they hold these immoral practices as legalised by their *mantras*. Similarly there are many other religious systems whose principles and practices are abhorrent to human feelings. It is not possible for a man to be so peaceful as to acquiesce in all these immoral practices. The same sad condition is observable in the principles to which different people adhere. Some are addicted to the lowest forms of fetishism, some worship trees, snakes, cats, dogs, fire, sun, moon, rivers, &c., while others worship human beings, as their God. Can we suppose all of them to be on the right path ?

It is the duty of men who come into this world for its regeneration to spread the truth upon the earth and extirpate falsehood out of it. If a righteous servant of God were told by dacoits or thieves that he should obtain certain property by extortion or theft, would it be right for him to join with them in the perpetration of such crimes ? Religion would teach him to eschew such evil deeds, for religion enjoins us to eschew all evil and impure doctrines and deeds, and not to take for our guides books which teach such immoral and impure practices and laws. I cannot understand how a man can honestly live at peace with all forms of religion and admit the truth of their principles knowing them to be false. Such a course would imply that no evil is evil, and false doctrines and evil deeds shall have to be regarded as high truths and virtues. To any one who would cast a glance at the different forms of religion prevalent in the world, it would be clear that in respect of the knowledge of the Supreme Being, various notions prevail, some of which cannot but be condemned. On the one extreme are the Athiests who do not

believe in the existence of God, and on the opposite are those who look upon men, or animals or heavenly bodies or the physical forces of nature as their God. Again, there are the Arya Samajists who consider themselves as the true heirs of the Vedic religion. They believe in the existence of a nominal Deity who they hold did not create a single particle of matter, nor brought into existence a single soul or a single germ of life. Matter and soul they regard as having existence independently of the Divine Being, nor do they consider Him as the originator of any of their properties or powers. With the creation of this universe they think Almighty God has nothing to do. By referring to this article of their creed, I only wish to point out that for a man of true righteousness, it is simply impossible to subscribe to all the creeds contradicting one another and to believe in them as true. My object here is not to point out the error of those who by their false beliefs derogate the Divine glory, dignity and power or legalise immoral practices, but only to show you that a conscientious being cannot treat the pure and the impure alike. To one who purifies himself the Divine face is undoubtedly revealed but methods which inculcate a belief in impure doctrines or enjoin immoral practices, can surely never lead to God. The love of God is no doubt a certain way to a heavenly life, but how can the man entertain true love for God who takes Rama, Krishna or Christ for his God or regards the Divine Being so weak and imperfect as not to be able to create a particle of matter or a soul? What is salvation but to know the true and perfect God with all His pure and perfect attributes and to walk in the ways of purity which He has shown us. This is the real salvation and every way opposed to it is a way of error, and no one can attain to true salvation by following error.

We witness in the world that religious beliefs are in most cases determined by training and habits. A Christian would have no hesitation in calling Jesus his God, while a Hindu would as easily fix upon Rama or Krishna as the true Deity or upon the Ganges as the supplier of all needs, or appoint for himself a God who created nothing and consider matter and soul as co-eternal with God and self-existent like Him. But all these trusts are vain, for they have no argument with them. To find his way to the living God should be the sole object of the seeker after truth. The world is constrained in the

bondage of customs and habits. Every one who is born in a religion deems it his duty to defend the same. But it can be easily seen that this principle is wrong. A man should adopt the religion which can point out the way to the living God whom extraordinary signs and miracles point out with certainty as the powerful and mighty God. For if God exists (and I swear by Him that His existence is the greatest of all certainties), then He must reveal Himself to His servants. The mere guesses of human reason that this world has a Creator are not sufficient to give satisfaction and make His existence a certainty. The man who trusts in these conjectures has no access to the Divine presence, and he cannot rely upon God with as great a certainty as he counts upon the cash which is locked up in his safe, or upon land and gardens which are the source of income to him, or upon sons on high posts who assist their father by sending in large donations of money every month. Why does he not trust upon God as he trusts upon all these material objects? Only because his faith in God is not a certain faith. Similarly a man who is negligent of his duty to the Divine Being, is bold in the commission of sin and does not fear God as he fears the plague, for instance, not going into a village where its devastating hand is busy at work, or as he fears the snake not daring to thrust his hand into its hole, or as he fears the lion not having the courage to go into a jungle which is its abode. The reason at the bottom of this boldness in the commission of sin is the same unbeleif in God, for while admitting God with the tongue, the heart is quite foreign to Him and negligent of Him. It is not easy to have a sincere faith in the Divine Being, for unless manifest and clear signs of His existence and power are witnessed, a man cannot understand that there is a God. Almost all men are believers in God by the word of the mouth, but their deeds show that their hearts are quite strangers to the true belief in Divine existence. True faith requires a certain knowledge as the knowledge of a thing after repeated experience. Experience for instance tells us that a very small quantity of strychnia is fatal. This experience giving rise to a certain faith in its power of killing will keep a man back from its use in a quantity which is likely to cause death. The person, therefore, who is in any way involved in the bondage of sin has no faith in God, for he has not recognized Him yet.

This world is the scene of many vanities, and most people are

satisfied with false principles of logic. The true religion is that which reveals the face of the living God and brings a man to have such near access to him that he sees Him. When thus filled with certainty he is brought into a close and deep connection with God. He is then freed from every sin and impurity and Almighty God is thenceforward his sole trust. He reveals Himself to him by His peculiar signs and His special manifestation and the revelation of His word. From that day he knows that God is, and from that hour he is purified and cleansed of all his internal impurities. This is the true knowledge of God which is the key to heaven, but this way is not open to any one except through Islam. This is the Divine promise from the beginning that He will reveal Himself to those who follow His Holy Word. Experience is our greatest witness and experience tells us that except through Islam God never reveals Himself to any one or honors any one with His Word or assists any one with His mighty signs. How can we in opposition to our clear experience admit that God reveals Himself in this manner to the followers of other religions also.

Some time ago, Lekh Ram, a Brahman by caste and an Arya by religion, came to me here at Qadian and asserted that the Vedas were the Word of God and that the Holy Quran was not His Word. I told him that since he asserted the Vedas to be the Word of God, and that since considering their present condition I did not hold them to be such for they taught *shirk* and many other impure doctrines, while I knew the Holy Quran to be of Divine origin for not only were its teachings free from the impurity of *shirk* and all other impurities, but by following it the face of the living God was revealed and heavenly signs were manifested, therefore it was necessary that we should agree upon some criterion for testing the truth of these assertions. I pointed out to him an easy way for deciding this point, *viz.*, that with the assistance of his Vedic God he should publish a prophecy concerning me, while inspired by the God who revealed the Holy Quran, I should also publish a prophecy concerning him. Upon this Lekh Ram published a prophecy concerning me that I would die of cholera within three years, while my God revealed to me that Lekh Ram would be murdered within six years and thus brought to naught on account of his abuse of the Holy Prophet of God. It was also revealed to me that the day of his murder would be next to the Muhammadan festival of 'Id, and

that shortly after his death plague would rage in the Punjab. All these facts of prophecy were published by me very frequently in my books and I further wrote that if the present Vedas were the Word of God, it was the duty of all the Arya Samajists to pray to their God as hard as they could for the safety of Lekh Ram, for it had been revealed to me that Lekh Ram would not be saved. The prophecy about my death from cholera within three years was published by Lekh Ram in his own book. The death of Lekh Ram in the manner predicted at last bore witness to the fact that the Vedas are not of a Divine origin.

This is only one instance. Thousands of similar supernatural signs have made it as clear as daylight that the religion of Islam is the only true religion in the world, and that other religions are either the inventions of human beings, or being originally from God became corrupt afterwards. Dear friend! I cannot accept the truth of your assertion without any argument for it. In this world a claim for the most trifling amount cannot be sustained unless sufficient proof is produced. How can then any weight be given to assertions for whose truth no argument is produced. God is one and His will is one; how can He then be the object of beliefs contradicting one another? How are we to believe the truth of everything said about Him, *viz.*, that Christ is God, or that Rama is God, or that Krishna is God, or that God is such a weak and powerless Being that He is not the Creator of a single particle in the universe? We can only accept the religion which has the light of proof with it and that religion is Islam. If you say that the great miracles and heavenly signs shown in Islam, are also shown in other religions, we would gladly listen to you provided that you bring forward proof of it. But it will never be possible for you to point out any living man of any religion who can be set against me in the blessings and heavenly signs granted to me.

You say in your letter that Almighty God has given an equal share to the believer and unbeliever in this world. The reason of this is that Almighty God has invited every one to Himself, and, therefore, has bestowed on all powers, the right use of which can lead them to the desired goal. But experience shows us that unless a person walks in obedience to Islam, these powers are abused and therefore the goal

is not reached. It is no doubt true as you say that it is very difficult that all people should follow one religion, but for the true seeker every difficulty is removed. Your illustration of travellers by the train and travellers on foot trying to reach the same destination does not apply in a religious matter, and the analogy does not hold true. There is only one way to find God, *viz.*, to attain to certainty by miracles and signs. True faith and purity of soul depend upon this. How can he reach God or be true in faith upon Him who has yet no certainty of his existence. There is no plurality of ways to find out God as in this world. There is only one way and that is certainty with regard to God on which also depends the purity of soul. But no religion except Islam has the means of certainty.

You write further on in your letter that God is infinite and, therefore, we cannot know Him except by doing away with the restraints of *shara'* (law). Now *shara'* is an Arabic word and it means a way, and hence particularly the way to God. Your argument is, therefore, reduced to this that to find God, we must leave the way which leads to Him. I leave it for you to consider the reasonableness of this assertion. As your remark, "Of caste and profession no one will question thee; worship God and of God shalt thou be," Islam takes no exception, for it does not make any distinction on the score of caste or nationality. Every one who seeks God, will find the way to Him to whatever nationality he may belong. But it is not true to say that every one can find the way to God to whatever religion he may belong, for unless the true and pure religion is followed, the way to God is not found. Religion and nationality are two quite different things.

Then drawing a wrong conclusion from your remark quoted above, you say: "This is the reason why the followers of the Vedas have not set on salvation the condition of following any particular person." The truth of this remark is not clear, for the person who does not consider it necessary for salvation to follow the author of the Veda, cannot admit the authority of the Veda but must regard it false. For instance, if a person does not admit the truth of the principles and injunctions of the Veda, rejects the *Niyoga*, *i.e.*, the immoral practice of allowing the wife to have illegal connection with strangers for the sake of children, or condemns the principle that God is not the creator of anything but

that everything is like God self-existent, or considers the worship of fire, sun, moon, &c., as mere fetishism and thus rejects the Veda as waste paper, so much so that he does not look upon the God presented by the Veda as the true God, will he be entitled to salvation or not? If he is, we would like to see the verse quoted from the Veda from which such a conclusion is drawn; but if he is not, then your assertion does not hold good. For, what we say is simply this that the person who does not believe in the truth of the injunctions of the Holy Quran shall not get salvation and shall lead his life like a blind man in this world. Almighty God says: و من يبتغ غير الا سلا م د ينا فلن يقبل منه و هو فى الا خرة من الخسرين which means that the person who shall not follow the religion of Islam which the Holy Quran preaches, will never be acceptable in the sight of God, and after death he shall be one of the lost. To say that the Veda does not require us to follow any person is not true, for to follow a book is the the same as to follow its author. If the Hindus do not follow the Veda, what does all this noise about it mean? Your last assertion that great men have been in every religion, does not carry any weight unless it is shown that some such great man who can show signs is living at the present time in any religion except Islam. Was Pandit Lekh Ram one of the great men, because his loss is bewailed by the Arya Samaj to this day?

QADIAN: MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD.
14th June 1903.

A Prophecy with regard to the end of certain cases.

29th June 1903.—The Promised Messiah received the following revelation from God as to the end of certain criminal cases instituted against him and by his followers: ا ن ا لله مع الذ ين ا تقوا و الذ ين هم محسنون فيه ا يا ت للسا ئلين "Verily God will be with those who are righteous and who do good. In it will be signs for inquirers."

(*For detail see inside of cover, opposite page 249.*)

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] AUGUST, 1903. No. 8.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

Monro on Sinlessness-Continued.

THE CHARGE AGAINST DAVID.

The charge of adultery brought against David by the Christian Missionaries may have some support in the Bible romance but not a single word of the Holy Quran leads to such a conclusion. Nay the Holy Quran gives the lie to such a charge in plain words, and the learned Muslim theologians and commentators treat it as a sheer falsehood. Thus Imam Fakhr-ud-din Razi, the greatest of the commentators, who has written the *Tafsir-i-Kabir*, says in relation to this point: الاكثرون المحققون والمحققون منهم يردونه ويحكمون عليه بالكذب والافساد *i.e.*, "Most of the commentators who are learned and have searched for the truth, falsify this charge (*i.e.*, the charge of adultery against David) and condemn it as a great lie and a mischievous story." Not only this, but Caliph Ali when he heard the false charge, caused it to be announced: من حدثكم بحديث داود على ما يرويه القصاص جلدته مائة وستين وهو حد الفرية على الانبياء "Whoever shall relate the story of David as the story-tellers relate it, I will give him 160 stripes, for such is the punishment of those who lay false charges against the prophets of God." The Caliph doubled the punishment, for, as he gave his reason further on, when a false charge of adultery against an ordinary believer was to be punished with eighty stripes, it was necessary that in the case of such a false charge against a prophet of God to whom no sin could be ascribed, the punishment should at least be doubled. It also appears from this that such false stories found currency in Muslim circles not through trustworthy and learned men but through the story-tellers,

This proclamation, by Caliph Ali, and the opinions of the more trustworthy commentators are sufficient to show the futility of the charge brought forward by the Christians against an innocent prophet of God; but to show how farther off such a statement is from the truth, we shall take the words of the Holy Quran itself and consider whether they lend any support to or condemn the statements of Mr. Monro and his fellow-workers. The Holy Quran relates the story of David as follows in the chapter entitled the Sad: اصبر على ما يقولون واذكر عبدنا داود ذا الايد انه اواب . . . . وشددنا ملكه وآتينه الحكمة وفصل الخطاب • وهل اتلك نبوء الخصم اذ تسوروا المحراب اذ دخلوا على داود ففزع منهم قالوا لا تخف خصمن بغى بعضنا على بعض فاحكم بيننا بالحق ولا تشطط واهدنا الى سوء الصراط • ان هذا اخى له تسع وتسعون نعجة ولى نعجة واحدة فقال اكفلنيها وعزنى فى الخطاب • قال لقد ظلمك بسوء الى نعجتك الى نعاجه وان كثيرا من الخلطاء ليبغى بعضهم على بعض الا الذين آمنوا وعملوا الصلحت وقليل ما هم وظن داود انما فتنه فاستغفر ربه وخر راكعا وانا ب • فغفرنا له ذلك وان له عندنا لزلفى وحسن ماب • يداود انا جعلنك خليفة فى الارض These are the verses on whose strength the charge is brought forward and how far it is really the case, the reader will see from these words. The first thing to be noted about this story is that it is both preceded and followed by words highly praising the prophet David, and it is simply absurd to suppose that an incident relating a most impious and black deed is placed between highly commendatory words. The story begins with the words: "Have patience, O Prophet, on what the unbelievers say and do against thee, and remember our servant David whom We gave power for he turned to Us . . . . . and We established his kingdom and bestowed upon him wisdom and skill to pronounce clear decisions." Here the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is enjoined to follow David in his quality of forbearing the evil of his enemies. The chapter containing these verses being revealed at Mecca, it is clear that the Holy Prophet was at that time severely persecuted by his enemies and in bearing those persecutions he was commanded to follow the example of David whom Almighty God, we are told, had granted a great kingdom. It is clear then that the story following this injunction must relate some act of great

and exemplary forbearance done by David, and not a heinous crime, for in that case the Holy Prophet would not have been called upon to follow him. To understand this the Christian Missionaries need not have faith as a grain of mustard seed, for this according to the criterion of their Gospels they have not, but if they have the same amount of reason in their brains, they can easily understand that the Holy Prophet could not be called upon to follow David in transgression and man open disobedience to Almighty God. It is strange indeed that a who teaches that "no one who commits adultery is a believer when he commits it," and that "whoever takes the slightest share in shedding the blood of an innocent person, shall come on the day of judgment with the words 'Despairer of the mercy of God' written on his forehead," should be commanded to follow the man who is in the very next verse described to have committed adultery and caused an innocent believer in God to be murdered. Moreover the Prophet could not be commanded to follow David in his quality of patience if the latter was unable to resist his evil passions. Again David is here honoured with the glorious title ن عبد *i.e.*, "Our servant." This description shows clearly that Almighty God regards David as a perfect man and, therefore, honors him with a title in which He draws attention to the true relation of David to Himself. The true relation of *'abd* (servant) to Allah (God) is one of perfect obedience to His commandments and complete submission and total resignation to His will. A man becomes the *'abd* of God when he is quite lost is his master and becomes as a dead man in the hands of God. It is then that he reaches the highest stage of *'aboodiyyat* in which he is honored with the title of ن عبد "Our servant" by God. A narrative of adultery and manslaughter could not be consistent with such a dignified title. A description of the "servants of God" is given in the *sura Furqan* where among other high qualifications, it is stated that they do not commit adultery or shed innocent blood. Again David is here described as having obtained power from God. Now this power does not simply mean a temporal power, for attention to his temporal power is drawn in the following words where it is said ن د شد و ملكه "We established his kingdom," and because temporal power has not been withheld from the unbelievers by God. The power here referred to is the spiritual power, the power to resist every evil tendency, and this is the power which gave him the quality of patience with regard to which the Holy

Prophet is commanded to follow David. We have, therefore, clear proof here that David had from God the power to walk in obedience to His commandments and shun every path of evil. This explanation is further supported by the next word in which David is described as اوّاب *awwab*. This word denotes exaggeration and is derived from the root اوب / which means to turn to God. David is, therefore, here described to be a man who turned to God in everything, *i.e.*, turned to His obedience in every deed. Attributing adultery and manslaughter to such a man in the very next verse is the sheerest nonsense. Further on still Almighty God says that He bestowed wisdom on David and this bestowal of wisdom He Himself thus describes in another place: "Upon ومن يوت الحكمة فقد اوتى خيرا كثيرا whomsoever wisdom is bestowed, to him the greatest good is given." Such are the high qualifications of David preceding the narrative which is said to relate his black deeds, nay the blackest deeds which a man could commit.

Before discussing the words of the narrative itself, it is necessary to consider how David is regarded by Almighty God after relating his alleged sins. Just where the narrative ends, Almighty God says : "And truly David had with us a near approach and an excellent retreat for his turning to us on all occasions." These qualifications can be consistent with a narrative describing his firm obedience to the Divine Being and not with one which marks him out as a guilty person openly transgressing the Divine commandments. Nowhere are the transgressors described in the Holy Quran as having near approach to God and an excellent retreat for their turning to God. In fact the two ideas are contradictory to each other. The transgressor is farthest off from the Divine Being and he turns to Satan instead of turning to God and, therefore, his turning is to be condemned and not praised as an excellent retreat. The most wonderful thing is that in consequence of the deeds related in the narrative, Almighty God is so pleased with David that he says to him : "O David, we make thee our vicegerent upon earth." A strange reward ! A man who for the perpetration of an evil deed went so far as to cause innocent bloodshed, is just at that moment singled out by Almighty God as His own representative, as if this were the only occasion on which Almighty God was pleased with his conduct. Could anything

more absurd be conceived? Just imagine the ridiculousness of Almighty God saying to David that since he had been guilty of an act of adultery and of murdering an innocent man, and since in obedience to his carnal passions he was blind to all rights human and Divine, therefore being pleased with him He gave him charge over His creatures and made him His own representative and vicegerent upon earth and a guardian of the rights of men. Were it the sincere desire of a single Christian to know the truth he would not have the slightest difficulty in understanding that the alleged charge of adultery is simply a fabrication, but these men seek the world and not the true and living God. We have shown that the context of the narrative being so far from lending any support to the charge, conclusively establishes the impossibility of any such incident. We shall now take the narrative itself and consider the conclusion to which it leads.

The words in which the Holy Quran describes the narrative have been quoted above. We translate them below:—

"And has the story of the enemies (of David) reached thee, O Prophet, when they climbed over the wall of his apartment where he used to worship God? When they entered in upon David, he was frightened at them (because of their evil intentions). They said, 'Be not afraid; we are two opposing parties to a case; one of us has wronged the other.' Judge, therefore, with truth between us, and do not postpone the case, but guide us to the right way. This, my brother, had ninety-nine ewes, and I had but a single ewe, and he said: 'commit this to my care; and he prevailed over me in the dispute.' David said: 'Certainly he has wronged thee in asking for thy ewe to add her to his own ewes and many of them who are concerned together in business as partners, wrong one another, except those who believe and do that which is right, but how few are they!' And David perceived that We had thrown him into a great trial, so he sought the protection of God and he fell down and bowed before God and turned to Him. So We gave him the protection prayed for, and truly he had a near approach with Us and an excellent turning. (So we said to him), O David, We make thee Our representative upon earth." Now in this whole narrative there is not a single word which can lead to the direct or indirect inference that David caused Uriah to be murdered or that he committed adultery with his wife. It is a pity that to support the weak theory

of atonement the Christians cannot afford to be respectful even to the grandfather of their God. The literal translation of the words of the Holy Quran given above gives the lie to the Christians who charge a holy prophet of God with base charges, and shows conclusively that whatever may be the origin of the story, the Word of God condemns it as a falsehood. What the Holy Quran relates is simply the narrative of the enemies of David who with the evil intention of murdering him jumped over the walls but being unable to perpetrate the evil deed advanced the pretence that they were parties to a case which they had brought before him for his immediate disposal. Seeing that his enemies were so bent upon taking away his life, which was, therefore, in great danger, David perceived that unless Almighty God took him under His special care and protection, he could not be safe, and therefore, he prayed to God for His protection (غفران) which, on account of his near access to God and his constantly turning to Him, Almighty God bestowed on him and removing all danger to his life, made him His vicegerent in that country. All authoritative commentaries cite this to be the meaning of the words, as Imam Razi says in his great work: "It is narrated that a party of the enemies were bent upon murdering David, the prophet of God, and he had a day set apart on which he used to worship God in solitude. His enemies thought this a suitable opportunity for carrying out their evil design and jumped over the walls of his apartment. When they entered in upon him, they found the guards and fearing lest they should be seized they invented a lie." In fact this is the only explanation which is in agreement with the circumstances related and which is supported by the context.

The story that the enemies spoken of were not enemies but only angels who had come to warn David of the sin he is alleged to have committed against Uriah and his wife, finds no support in the words of the Holy Quran. There is not a single word to show that they were angels. On the other hand, their jumping over the walls and not coming in through the gates or appearing supernaturally to David, shows clearly that they were neither actual parties to a suit nor angels, but the enemies of David who thinking David to be alone and unguarded then, jumped over the walls lest the guards at the gates should seize them. Moreover if they were angels, they could not

have told a lie and said that they were parties to a suit whereas they were not actually so. If David had really committed a sin, was there no other way left to God to make him conscious of it; nay, was David's consciousness of sin so lost that he could not feel that by committing adultery and shedding innocent blood, he had done anything against the will of God, and that two angels were required to tell a lie to make David conscious of his guilt. The fictitious story, therefore, charges one of the great prophets with the blackest of deeds and the angels of God with lying and fabrication. Moreover if David were really guilty of the heinous crime of setting at naught all laws human and Divine, how could he speak the words which he is related to have spoken while giving his judgment وان كثيرا من الخلطا ء ليبغى بعضهم على بعض الا الذين آمنوا وعملوا الصلحت "Most of those who are mixed up in business, *i.e.*, neighbours, relatives, partners, &c., wrong one another *except those who believe and do good deeds.*" Evidently he classes himself with the latter as one of those who fully discharge their duties to their neighbours and relatives or to other men who are in any way connected with them. If his judgment means anything, it means this that he himself being one of those who believe and do good deeds could not be guilty of a crime of which one of the parties before him was proved to be guilty. Now when David says plainly that he could not deprive another of his property or do the slightest injustice to him, it is the height of absurdity to suppose that he had been guilty of the most heinous crime of causing a man to be murdered and having illegal connection with his wife. If he had really been guilty, then instead of making himself an exception to the ordinary doers of injustice, he should have classed himself as the worst of all of them. Moreover, the injunction to the Holy Prophet to forbear the evil if his enemies like David is quite absurd if instead of an act of forbearance an evil deed is related as an instance of the doings of David. The force of such an injunction is however clear when the story is interpreted as we have done above; for it is clear that under these circumstances David showed the greatest forbearance and instead of doing any injury to his bitter enemies who had come with the evil intention of taking his life, he freely forgave them and resorted to his heavenly master for protection. He could have put his enemies te death if he liked because he had the power to do so, but as he turned to God constantly, so did he do on this occasion too:

and instead of acting in obedience to his own desires sought the protection of God. The words فتنّاه and وظن داود انما and استغفر ربه do not necessitate the absurd supposition of adultery. The former expression means that "David perceived that we had thrown him into a trial" which is equivalent to saying that his life was in great danger. The second expression means that "he sought the protection of God" as has already been shown in discussing the meaning of *istighfar* at length.

It may not be out of place to say a few words as to the origin of this fictitious story. In the reign of Solomon's son as much of the glory departed, the Jews who had shaken off his yoke, conceived an aversion towards him and, therefore, also towards his father and grandfather. With the lapse of time this hatred grew stroger and ripened into bitter enmity. Hence they went so far as to circulate false reports about David and Solomon. They declared Solomon as an idolator and it was for this reason that the Holy Quran thought it necessary to refute the charge of unbelief brought against Solomon in the words وما كفر سليمن *i.e.*, "Solomon was not an unbeliever." Such an expression was rendered necessary for a refutation of the serious charge of unbelief brought against Solomon. Another instance of such a refutation is that in the case of Jesus. The legitimacy of his birth was attacked by the Jews and, therefore, Almighty God refuted it by stating that the soul of Jesus was from God and not a Satanic soul. Both expressions would have been unnecessary had there been no false charge. In short, fictitious stories regarding David and Solomon were current among the Jews and ultimately became a part of the national belief. At the advent of the Holy Prophet when large numbers of Jews entered into Islam, these stories were still believed by them to be true. It was the currency of these false stories that rendered necessary the proclamation by Ali referred to above. But as the number of Jews coming to Islam increased, and the hold of the pure principles of Islam relaxed with the lapse of time, a fresh credence was gained by the false stories and in this manner they found their entrance into some careless commentators. But as shown above, the context, the words of the narrative and the opinions of the best commentators as well as other considerations such as Caliph Ali's proclamation condemn the stories charging David with adultery and manslaughter and maintain the unsullied purity of his character.

Not a single word supports the charge against David but a story is told of Jesus in connection with a woman of a notoriously bad character and we wish to know how the purity of Jesus is to be established if every word of the Gospels is to be believed true. He got himself anointed by a harlot with ointment which was part of her earnings of adultery and allowed her to take undue liberty with him (Luk. 9 : 38). Notwithstanding youth and bachelorship he had too familiar connections with some women of dubious character. He even praised harlots (Matt. 21 : 31). Had a single circumstance like this been related of David or any other prophet of God in the Holy Quran, the Christian Missioneries would have considered it as the clearest proof of sinfulness. But here is a beam in the Missionary's eye and he does not see it. Had the circumstances which are related of Jesus in the Gospels been related of any other prophet, we would have had a number of articles from Monros and Qalandars that such and such a prophet was guilty of such and such heinous crimes, but every such circumstance when related of Jesus in the Gospels is lauded and praised as a sublime moral deed and a thousand lessons are drawn from it for the edification of the Christians. We have never been able to understand the logic of the Missionaries. We are told to believe that because David resorted to *istighfar*, *i.e.*, sought the protection of God, therefore he was an adulterer, and because Jesus freely mixed with harlots and allowed them to take undue liberty with him, therefore he was a good man. Greater enemies of righteousness than these abusers of prophets and deifiers of a weak human being, were never born. They do not know to purify their own hearts but the cleanliness of others' hearts is condemned by them as the veriest impurity.

CHARGES AGAINST THE HOLY PROPHET.

Mr. Monro ends his list of charges against the prophets of God with two charges against the Holy Prophet of Arabia. He quotes two passages* of the Holy Quran as referring to alleged sinful deeds of the Holy Prophet. The first passage is that occurring in the *Sura Ahzab*. After giving a translation of a portion of a verse in that *Sura*, Mr. Monro has the audacity to remark : " Does not this mean that

*The remaining four passages to which Mr. Monro refers are dealt with under the heading of *zanb* and *istighfar*, because in these passages, particular sinful deeds are not alleged as in the two here discussed.

Muhammad was rebuked by God for committing a sin in fearing men." But in the verse to which he refers he cannot point out a single word showing that the Prophet feared men in the sense in which he ought to have feared God, or that he did not fear God, or that God was rebuking him or that any sin was attributable to him for the alleged fearing from men. Here is the verse with a literal translation of it: وا ذ تقو ل للذ ى ا نعم ا لله عليه وا نعمت عليه ا مسک عليک زو جک و ا تق ا لله و تخفى فى نفسک ما ا لله مبد يه و تخشى ا لنا س وا لله ا حق ا ن تخشه فلما قضى زيد منها و طرا زو جنكها لكي لا يكو ن على ا لمو منين حرج فى ا زو اج ا د عيا ئهم ا ذ ا قضوا منهن و طرا و كا ن ا مرا لله مفعولا "And remember when thou didst any to him to whom God had shown favor and to whom thou also hadst shown favor, 'Keep thy wife to thyself and fear God,' and thou didst conceal what God would bring to light, and thou didst fear men, but God has greater right to be feared. And when Zaid divorced her and had no more connection with her, we married her to thee so that it might not be a crime in the faithful to marry the wives of their adopted sons when they have divorced them, and the command of God was thus to be fulfilled." Now the simple act of fearing others than God is not a sin however considered. Mr. Monro ought to have quoted the verse of the Holy Quran which supported his views. Moses feared the Egyptians and fled to Madian, yet he did not commit a sin in doing so. Again, when he threw the rod at the command of God and it turned into a serpent, Moses feared it, but nowhere is this fearing described to be a sin. Once more, when Moses met the magicians and their cords and rods were made to appear to him as if they ran along, فا و جس فى نفسه خيفة مو سى "Then Moses conceived a secret fear within him." Yet on none of these occasions Mr. Monro holds Moses to have been rebuked by God for committing a sin in fearing others than Him. Numerous instances may be quoted from the Bible of such fearing on the part of the righteous prophets, where it is never considered a sin. Of Zacharias who according to Luke was "righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless," it is related by the same writer that "he was troubled and fear fell upon him" on the sight of an angel. Yet he is nowhere rebuked for committing a sin in fearing others than God. We need not multiply instances. The fact is that "fear is a passion, implanted

in nature, that causes a flight from an approaching evil." Such fear is however quite different from the fear of God which means to have a reverential awe of the Divine Being which enables one to walk in obedience to His will and to look upon sin as a consuming fire. In this particular sense no prophet of God ever feared any one besides God. The verse next to that quoted above testifies to this. Almighty God says: الذ ين يبلغو ن ر سلت الله و يخشو نه و لا يخشو ن ا حد ا ا لا ا لله "Those who deliver the messages of God and fear Him and do not fear any one besides God." Here all the prophets are plainly described as not fearing any one besides God in the sense in which they ought to fear God, and the Holy Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم being one of the prophets is, therefore, free from the charge of having committed a sin in fearing others than God. Mr. Monro could have easily seen these words written in the Quran in the same place where he picked up certain words to charge the Prophet with a sin, but prejudice did not allow him to make right use of his eyesight in the perusal of the Word of God. This description of the prophets shows clearly that the fear displayed by Moses or the Holy Prophet or any other prophet of God on a particular occasion did, in no way contradict his fear of God, for it is in a different sense that the word is used in that case. Not only the Holy Prophet had no fear of any one besides God, but it is also said of his companions in the Holy Quran that they did not fear the blame of any blamer (لا يخا فو ن لو مة لا ئم) If the disciples did not fear any one besides God according to the Holy Quran, how could such a charge be brought against the great Teacher.

To trace the exact meaning of the phrase و تخشى ا لنا س "And thou didst fear men," it is necessary to consider the whole question of Zaid's marriage with Zainab and the subsequent divorce. The first verse occurring on this subject in the *Sura Ahzab* and just preceding the verse under discussion runs as follows: وما كا ن لمو من و لا مو منة ا ذ ا قضى ا لله و ر سو له ا مرا ا ن يكو ن لهم ا لخير ة من ا مر هم و من يعص ا لله و ر سو له فقد ضل ضلا لا مبينا "And it is not for a believer, man or woman, to have any choice in their affairs, when God and His Apostle have decreed a matter: and whoever disobeys God and His Apostle walks in manifest error." Regarding the occasion on which

this verse was revealed, the following account is given in "*The Lubab-un-Naqool fi Asbab-in-Nazool*" (the essence of reports on the occasions of revelation) by the learned Sayooti. "Tabrani reports on the authority of Qatada through trustworthy reporters in an authentic report the following account. He says: 'The Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, asked Zainab in marriage intending her for Zaid. She thought that he himself intended to marry her. When she came to know that it was Zaid with whom he intended to marry her, she refused. Upon this was revealed the verse quoted above." Another version is given in the same book in the following words: "Ibni-Jarîr reports through 'Akrima on the authority of Ibn-i-Abbas that the Prophet of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, asked in marriage Zainab, daughter of Jahsh, for Zaid, son of Harisa, but she refused to accept him as a husband, and said that she was of a higher descent and a nobler family than the man. Then God revealed to the Prophet the verse which says: 'And it is not for a believer, man or woman, to have choice, &c." up to the end of the verse." The same version is according to the same anothor reported through another channel.

These concurring versions of the report which are admitted as being authentic and reported on the authority of trustworthy reporters prove conclusively that the Holy Prophet had asked the hand of Zainab in marriage for Zaid, but the lady and her guardians though glad to accept the Prophet himself as her husband, rejected Zaid on the ground that he was not a suitable match for the high-born lady. The Prophet however had no mind to marry her himself and he wished her only for Zaid. The lady and her brother being persistent in refusal, Almighty God reproved them in the matter and told them in a general injunction to all believers that they had no choice left to them in a matter decided by God and His Apostle, and that if they did not obey God and His Apostle, they would be in manifest error. Upon this command from the Almighty, Zainab and her brother yielded to the match proposed by the Prophet and Zainab became the wife of Zaid.

So far as to the marriage, and the reader will see from this account the utter falsity of the base charges of the Christian Missionaries. It should be further borne in mind that Zainab was very

nearly related to the Prophet of God. Her mother was Umema, daughter of Abdul Muttalib, the grandfather of the Holy Prophet. The mother of Zainab was thus a sister of the father of the Holy Prophet. (See Asadul Ghabah fi Ma'rifat-is-Sahabah, Volume V, page 463). Add to this very close relationship the fact that she was one of the earliest Muslims and was moreover a *Muhajira* (one of the refugees who fled from Mecca on account of the persecutions of the unbelievers). From this it would appear that Zainab was very well known to the Prophet, and all the circumstances, her close relationship to the Prophet, her early conversion to Islam, her subsequent flight along with the believers to Medina, lead to the undeniable conclusion that the Prophet knew her intimately and must have seen her on numerous occasions in her childhood as well as in her youth. Moverover the two sexes mingled freely in Arab society and the seclusion of women was enjoined only by Islam. But even in Islam the seclusion of women was not enjoined until after the marriage of Zainab with the Holy Prophet. Since Christian writers on Islam have admitted this, we need not quote original authorities on the point. Now under the circumstances that Zainab was so closely related to the Holy Prophet, being his real aunt's daughter, that she was a member of the very small society that gathered about the Prophet very early, that she fled from Mecca with the Holy Prophet to Medina, that the Holy Prophet sued her in marriage for Zaid, and that there was no seclusion of women at that time, the conclusion cannot be avoided that the story of the Prophet having seen Zainab by chance through on half-open door and fallen in love with her on account of her great beauty is the basest and the most monstrous falsehood that was ever devised. On the other hand, we find him rejecting her when on asking her in marriage for Zaid, she offered herself for the Holy Prophet. If lust was the motive of his marriage afterwards when she had grown to the age of 35 years, what circumstance compelled the Holy Prophet to reject her when she was more youthful? The veil of prejudice that hangs before the Christian eye is too thick to allow it to see circumstances as they really are.

Now it would appear from the account which is regarded as the only true and authentic account by Muslim authorities that it was

the Holy Prophet himself who insisted upon the marriage of Zainab with Zaid, and that the lady herself and her brother were both unwilling to have such a match. A revelation from God however decided the matter in favor of the Prophet. The Divine injunction stated in plain terms that Zainab and her brother had no choice in the matter when the Holy Prophet had decided it. Upon this Zainab and her brother yielded. With regard to this marriage it was, therefore, well-known that the lady and her relations were loth to the match, but that the marriage was performed in obedience to the Divine commandment. This point should be particularly noted, for we shall have to call attention to it later on. It was upon express revelation from God that Zainab had given her consent to marry Zaid, and this was well-known among the friends and foes of Islam. Both, the believers and the unbelievers who had any interest in the affairs of the Muslims, knew it that not only had the Prophet personally insisted upon the marriage of Zainab with Zaid, but that the matter was ultimately decided in obedience to a Divine revelation that the decision of the Prophet was the decision of God and that disobedience to it was a manifest error. The people, therefore, looked to the future of this marriage which had been performed in obedience to a commandment from on high. The lady was loth to the match but the Divine commandment had settled that the marriage should be performed.

We will now consider the post-nuptial circumstances. Attention is called to this subject by the opening words of the verse: وإذ تقول للذى أنعم الله وأنعمت عليه أمسك عليك زوجك واتق الله "And remember when thou didst say to him to whom God had shown favor and to whom thou also hadst shown favor, 'Do not divorce thy wife and fear God.'" From this it appears that Zaid was going to divorce his wife, but the Holy Prophet gave him strict injunction not to divorce her. On this point Hakam reports on the authority of Anas that "Zaid, son of Harisa, came to the Prophet of God, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, complaining of (the haughtiness of) Zainab, daughter of Jahsh, and the Holy Prophet said to him, 'Do not divorce thy wife and fear God.'" (*Lubab-un-Naqool fi Asbab-in-Nazool*). What happened after the marriage was, therefore, this that Zainab who belonged to the noblest Quresh family treated her husband Zaid, wh

was the freedman of the Prophet, with contempt, and her haughty demeanour became quite unbearable by Zaid. So he came to the Prophet complaining of this and expressed his determination to divorce her. The Prophet forbade him in the emphatic words امسک علیک زوجک واتق الله "Do not divorce thy wife and fear God." To say that these words proceeded from unwilling lips is the basest dishonesty, whether Muir or Monro or any other meek preacher of the Gospel of the lamb may be the author of it. Would not Jesus according to this rule be a wolf—nay, worse than a wolf—in a lamb's clothing. Ah! when will the time come when these Christian Missionaries will learn to be honest? When will they see that abusing the holy ones of God is no service to their own poor master. If all the saints of the world are charged with sins, a weak mortal, a poor creature who remained for nine months in the womb of a woman, would not thereby become the Omnipotent God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe. Zaid came to the Prophet and complained to him of the haughtiness of his wife due to her consciousness of her own high birth and expressed his desire of divorcing her. The Holy Prophet gave him the strict injunction not to divorce her, and this the enemies of truth declare to have proceeded from insincere lips. If, as is alleged, the Prophet knew that Zaid was aware of his intention to marry his wife and was divorcing her for his sake, could he utter the words واتق الله "O Zaid, fear God and divorce not thy wife." Could a guilty conscience utter such words? Nay these words could not but proceed from the deepest depth of the heart of him who uttered them. "Fear God" is not an expression which a guilty heart can speak to a man who is aware of his guilty intentions. Is it conceivable that such words can be addressed from an insincere heart to a man who is aware of that insincerity? And who is this man Zaid? By what tie is he bound to the Prophet of God? It is the delicate tie between the disciple and the master. The disciple believes the master a messenger from the Most High to call the people to righteousness, one who speaks to God and is spoken to by Him, perfect in his righteousness and a model of virtue whom he must imitate and follow in all his words and deeds. Remember this relation which is based on righteousness and conceive the master saying to his disciple: "Be righteous before God and do not divorce thy wife." Iniquity and injustice could go no further than suppose that these words

were insincere. Was there no sincerity in the words "fear God?" If these words did not come from the heart, why did they go straight to the hearts of the disciples who sacrificed their lives and everything that was dear to them in obedience to his will. Is there a single circumstance lending the slightest support to this monstrous supposition?

To come back to the point from which we started, when Zaid on account of domestic difficulties wished to divorce his wife Zainab, the Prophet was against it. Various reasons weighed with him. Zainab was related to him very closely and Zaid his freedman was loved by him very dearly. He could not wish a pair so dear and near to him to be separated. Moreover it was he himself who had insisted upon the marriage of Zainab with Zaid when the relations of the former were all opposed to this union. What they would say on the lady being divorced could be easily seen, and this, the Prophet thought, would be a source of great trouble to him. Her relatives would say to him that as he had compelled them to give her hand in marriage to a freedman, it was his duty to prevent the dissolution of the marriage-tie. But the most important reason which had the greatest weight with the Prophet was the Divine revelation which commanded Zainab and her relations to submit to the orders of the Prophet of God. He saw that ignorant people would make it a point of objection that a marriage performed in obedience to a Divine revelation had such a sad end. He also knew that the divorce would give an opportunity to the unbelievers to hold in derision the Divine revelation itself which sanctioned the marriage. It was for this reason that he ordered Zaid not to divorce his wife, for he knew that ignorant men would say that if Almighty God knew beforehand that the marriage would not prove to be a happy union, why did He send a revelation to His Prophet requiring the bride and her guardians to submit to the Prophet against their wishes. So after the portion of the verse quoted above, follow words expressive of the Prophet's state of mind under these circumstances: وتخفی فی نفسک ما اللہ مبدیہ وتخشی الناس واللہ احق ان تخشہ "And thou didst hide in thy mind what God would reveal and thou didst fear men, and God has more right that thou shouldst fear Him." Following immediately the injunction of the Prophet to Zaid that he should not divorce his wife, these words express the state of

mind in which the Prophet was and give as it were a reason for the Prophet's forbidding Zaid to divorce her. He knew that if the family-strife between Zainab and Zaid were reported abroad, it would give an occasion to the evil-minded carpers to find fault with the Prophet that a marriage which he had proposed and insisted upon, and consent to which had ultimately been obtained by a Divine revelation, ended so miserably. He moreover knew that such an objection would keep back many ignorant men who had not a deep insight into spiritual matters from accepting the truth. Therefore it was his earnest desire that Zaid should not divorce his wife and that the quarrel should not be rumoured abroad. It was this that the Prophet wished to hide, but the Divine will was that it should be revealed because as suggested later on in the same verse a great object was to be fulfilled by the divorce. What the Prophet feared was the cavilling of the evil-minded enemies of Islam, and the fact that such a superficial objection to Divine revelation would be a bar to many in the acceptance of the truth. He feared people but he feared them only for their own sake. Elsewhere Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: لعلک باخع نفسک الا یکونوا مومنین "Wilt thou kill thyself with anxiety that these people do not believe." An ignorant man will take this to be a rebuke to the Holy Prophet, but the fact is that here the Holy Prophet is praised for the great anxiety which he had for the welfare of his people. In the words تخشی الناس the same anxiety for the welfare of people is expressed. As a man whose sympathy for his fellow-beings was unbounded, the Prophet wished that the matter should be hushed up and that Zaid should be restrained from resorting to divorce but his prophetic office, the voice of heaven, soon told him that Almighty God had another great object to fulfil and, therefore, he had no need to fear men, for God whose wisdom willed to bring about the divorce, had more right to be feared. The good of people was no doubt before the eyes of the Prophet, but Divine wisdom had ordained the fulfilment of another great object, the extirpation of the custom of adoption, and, therefore, in the words واللہ احق ان تخشہ there is an injunction to the Prophet to submit to the Divine will altogether and not to fear that the divorce will lead to any evil consequence. Up to this time the Prophet had no desire to marry Zainab because he had already a year or two before declined to marry her when asking her in marriage for Zaid.

Zaid persisted in the divorce and the Holy Prophet knowing it to be the Divine will that the divorce should take place, refrained from interfering any more and resigned himself to the Divine will in the matter. After this we are told in the Holy Quran that the divorce took place and the prescribed term for divorced women passed away. This is stated in the words فلما قضى زيد منها وطرا After this follow the words زوجنكها *i.e.*, "Then did We marry her to thee." Mark the form of this expression. It is not stated that then "thou didst wish to marry her" or "thou didst marry her" and we gave thee permission but that "*We married her to thee.*" Do not these words establish conclusively that the Prophet married her in obedience to express Divine commandment which was not given until Zaid had divorced her and the term prescribed for divorced women had expired. Had the marriage been performed in obedience to the Prophet's own wish, the Holy Quran ought to have stated so. But Almighty God tells us plainly that it was He who commanded the Prophet to marry Zainab. The question naturally arises here, why was it that Almighty God did not command the Prophet to marry Zainab on the previous occasion and sanctioned her marriage with Zaid at that time, but now that such a saddening separation had taken place between two persons who were so near and dear to the Prophet, the command was given to the Prophet to marry Zainab. Almighty God knew that the marriage of Zainab and Zaid would give rise to disunion; why did He not then command the Prophet to marry her himself at the very outset? The answer to this question is given in the Holy Book itself in the following words which follow the command of marriage immediately and give the reason. These words are: لكى لا يكون على المومنين حرج فى ازواج ادعيائهم اذا قضوا منهن وطرا وكان امر الله مفعولا *i. e.*, "(The reason of Our giving this command to the Prophet to marry Zainab is) that there might be no obstacle to the faithful in marrying the wives of their adopted sons when they have divorced them. This was the decree of God that was to be fulfilled (in the Prophet's marriage with Zainab)." Here is a reason assigned in plain words for the Divine commandment to the Prophet to marry the divorced wife of Zaid who was known as his adopted son. There is no ambiguity about these words and no doubt can be entertained as to their true meaning. Had it been the Prophet's own desire to marry

Zainab, the reason given by the Holy Book would have been meaningless. But two questions may be asked here. Is the custom of adoption an evil custom? Was it necessary for the Prophet to set an example to extirpate it if it was really pernicious? Here we can give only very brief answers to these questions. That the custom of adoption is an evil custom cannot be denied. A man cannot become a son or a father by mere word of mouth. Moreover the custom is based on a falsehood which keeps a man far away from righteousness. The evil effect of the custom has been fully realized in the Hindu religion. The custom of adoption has there given rise to the immoral doctrine of the *niyoga*, according to which a married woman is required to have carnal knowledge of others than her own husband to raise up sons to the nominal father from the seed of strangers. Such is the evil effect of the custom of adoption. It was, therefore, necessary for the Holy Prophet whose mission was to uproot all evil principles and practices to give a death-blow to this evil custom. But this could not be done without his setting an example himself. It is the secret of the success which attended the mission of the Holy Prophet that he set an example in all that he required his followers to do. The deep Divine wisdom which he possessed enabled him to see that human nature could not be prompted to do a thing unless there was an example before it. Why did Jesus fail in his mission? Because the Gospel-teachings are impracticable and, therefore, Jesus himself could not set an example to his followers. Why are the Christian nations debased with drunkenness? Because Jesus himself drank wine. Look at the Prophet of Islam, how with his good example of total abstinence, he succeeded in uprooting the evil of drunkenness from among his followers. The Prophet was a guide to his followers in every phase of life. He showed them how they could walk in righteousness by himself walking in it. The extirparion of evil customs is the hardest part of the task of a reformer. Inveterate customs grow into habits and become as it were parts and parcels of human nature. A thousand volumes written and preached on their evil effects would not make one individual leave them, to say nothing of their extinction. But Almighty God had given the Prophet the keys of heaven and earth. He knew where to strike the blow to cause death. The Holy Quran had taught his companions: لقد كان لكم في رسول الله اسوة حسنة "Verily for you there is in the Prophet of God a model of virtue." So they did what they saw

him doing. Whenever he saw a deep-rooted aversion to an act he did it first himself. This was the reason that Almighty God commanded the Prophet to marry the divorced wife of Zaid, because he had not become his son by being called a son. From this will be seen the necessity of the commandment to the Prophet. Had the Prophet himself any intention to marry Zainab whom he knew from her childhood, he could do so easily when she was quite young or at least when she had offered herself to the Prophet on his asking her in marriage for Zaid? But the object of the marriage was no other than to extirpate the evil custom of looking upon the adopted son as the real son. Hence the Divine revelation first sanctioned the marriage of Zainab with Zaid as the Prophet wished. But on the second occasion Almight God allowed Zaid to divorce his wife and did not give sanction to what the Prophet wished, and then after the divorce commanded the Prophet to marry the divorced lady. It is to the fulfilment of this Divine purpose that attention is called in the concluding words of the verse: وكان امر الله مفعولا "And the command of God was thus to be fulfilled," and again immediately afterwards: وكان امر الله قدرا مقدورا "And the command of God was a decree ordained beforehand." All the apparent objections to the Divine sanction of the marriage of Zaid with Zainab and the subsequent divorce vanish with these words of God, because here He informs us that all this was done by Him to fulfil a purpose fixed beforehand, and that purpose He has Himself stated to be the extirpation of the evil custom of adoption.

The next verse states even more clearly that the marriage of the Prophet with Zainab was only in obedience to the Divine commandment and not his own passions or wishes. It says: ما كان على النبى من حرج فيما فرض الله له "No blame attaches to the Prophet in what God imposed upon him as a duty." Mr. Monro ought to feel ashamed if he has any sense of shame. The verse says plainly that the marriage had been imposed upon the Prophet as a duty by God Himself and no blame whatever attaches to the Prophet. Is the Prophet of God "rebuked for committing a sin," or is he declared free from every blame with which his blind and ignorant enemies may charge him? The word فرض proves conclusively that the Prophet himself had no wish to marry Zainab, but Almighty God gave him the express com-

mandment to do so and imposed it upon him as a duty which he could not lay aside. The Prophet is moreover here declared quite blameless, and Mr. Monro's presumption of sin is an arrogant presumption. There is no presumption of sin in this case but clear proof of sinlessness. Mr. Monro's particular charge that the sin was committed in fearing men is also condemned as false in the very next verse which says: الذين يبلغون رسلت الله و يخشونه ولا يخشون احدا الا الله "Those who deliver the messages of God to people, and fear God only and do not fear any one besides God." These are general words and it is folly to limit them to the deliverance of messages only. Had the words و يخشونه not interposed, such folly would have been permissible, but the interposing words "and they fear God only" shows clearly that it is a different description from the previous one which says "who deliver the messages of God." In fact these are all descriptions of the words الذين خلوا من قبل "Those who have passed before" occurring in the previous sentence. Who are meant by the words "those who have passed before" is here stated. By these are meant, says the verse, "those who deliver the messages of God and fear God only and do not fear any one besides God." A drowning man, they say, catches at straws, and Mr. Monro may find it convenient to remark in order to keep up his reputation as a first class Missionary inasmuch as he is the greatest abuser of the prophets of God, that this is only a description of the earlier prophets. But he ought to know that as a prophet, the Holy Prophet is included in this description, and had this description not been intended of him, it would have been quite meaningless. He may also read the verses which he has himself often quoted showing that the Prophet is like the prophets who went before. He shall have also to remember that he does not regard the earlier prophets as blameless and, therefore, there is no reason why he should regard this description as applicable to the earlier prophets and not to the Holy Prophet. Let him also bear in mind that the fearing of Moses who is one of those who passed before, is also related in the Holy Quran. and, therefore, if this description is applicable to him, it is also applicable to the Holy Prophet.

We have already stated that wherever a Prophet is described to have feared others than God, it is not at all meant that he feared them as he ought to have feared God, or that he did not at that particular

moment fear God. We have also shown that such fearing is nowhere described as sinful in the Holy Quran, and if it is, Mr. Monro will kindly quote the verse by reference to his valuable concordance. It should also be noted that fearing in this sense is the requirement of the very nature of man. On account of his humanity, a prophet may also fear in this manner, but the Divine support immediately takes him by the hand and suppresses the human weakness. This is testified to in the words وتخشى الناس والله احق ان تخشاه These words are expressive of the state of mind in which the Prophet then was. A revelation is not the outcome of a particular state of the mind but it is granted by Almighty God according to the state of mind and is an image of it. No sooner does the Prophet conceive the idea that in doing a certain thing he is fearing men, in whatever sense we may take his fearing, the idea at once takes possession of the heart that the real fear is that of God and not of anything besides Him. It is not true to say that the fear of men had gained any possession of the heart of the Prophet. On the other hand this idea is repelled so soon as it enters the heart by the more strong and firm idea due to his prophetic character, to the constant support of the Divine Being granted to him, that the fear of men in any sense is nothing, and it is really God who deserves to be feared. The human weakness is thus at once suppressed by the Divine strength. The prophets of God have a human nature and, therefore, they are subject to all human weaknesses and human infirmities. But the grace of God is constantly with them and, therefore, no sooner a human weakness begins to operate than the grace of God at once comes to their support. We do not believe the prophets of God to be free from human weakness, but we believe that this weakness in their case is suppressed by the strength and support of God. It is for this reason that when the fear of aught besides God enters the heart of a prophet, though it is not a fear of the same nature as the fear of God, the fear of God at once expels the temporary fear and permanently takes its place. Hence it is that the words تخشى الناس are immediately followed by the words والله احق ان تخشاه the latter words being expressive of the permanent and stable state of the mind of the Prophet. The first was a requirement of the human nature and the second was due to the very close connection with God which the Prophet had. Similarly where Moses' fear is described we have the words فاوجس فى

خيفة موسى نفسه, *i.e.*, the human nature in Moses perceived a fear, (the fear of course being that the people would be deceived by the magician's doings); and the next words are قلنا لا تخف انك انت الاعلى, *i.e.*, the voice of God spoke at once within him, 'Do not fear, for thou shalt be the uppermost.' Here too no sooner the fear enters the heart because of the human nature than the better nature, the Divine voice, at once comes with the assurance of his own victory and the former idea is expelled as soon as it is conceived. The fact is that the idea conceived by the human nature of a Prophet gains no ground over his heart, but the support of God due to *istighfar* at once takes him by the hand and places him above the weakness of human nature. The idea due to human nature is so momentary that it vanishes as soon as it is formed.

It will be clear from the above exegesis of the verses of the Holy Quran that the various incidents of the narrative are described in succession. At first there is the Divine sanction to the marriage of Zaid with Zainab because it was opposed by the latter. Then there is the quarrel and the Prophet's injunction to Zaid, not to divorce his wife, and his fear for the people to whom it might prove a stumbling-block. Then follows the divorce. The prescribed term after divorce then passes away and the Prophet receives a commandment from the Almighty to marry Zainab. The reason of this marriage is then given that there may be no harm for the faithful to marry the divorced wives of those whom they call their sons only by word of mouth. It is then stated that this was the great purpose, the fulfilment of which was brought about through all these events. The Prophet is then declared free from every charge in connection with this marriage, and it is stated that the marriage was imposed upon him by God as a duty. Lastly it is stated that it should not be imagined that in fearing men the Prophet committed any sin for the prophets of God never fear any one besides God in the sense in which they fear God. Thus we have shown that the fear of the Prophet was in respect of the divorce, and Bokhari also states in an authentic tradition that these words were revealed in connection with the matters of Zaid and Zainab, thus intimating that they refer to the disagreement and the divorce. But even if the words are taken to refer to the Prophet's fear, that people would say that he married the wife of his

adopted son, none of the arguments furnished above is thereby weakened. The adopted son was looked upon according to Arab custom as the real son of the adoptive father and, therefore, marriage with his divorced wife was a step strongly opposed to inveterate Arab custom. If, therefore, the Prophet feared the objections of the people in contracting such a marriage, he is as blameless as in the former case. The fear is still of the same nature, and every argument advanced above in proof of the blamelessness of the Prophet in this matter is still applicable with the same force. Mr. Monro's objection is, therefore, as groundless according to this interpretation as according to the one which we have adopted. We do not reject the former interpretation, though we think that the context favors the latter. But our arguments are equally applicable in both cases.

The version of this story as given above, is the same as found in authentic and correct reports, and it is the only true account. But as this version does not suit the purpose of the Christian Missionaries, they rely on a false version with as great an arrogance as they rely on a false Deity. It is stated that when Zainab was married to Zaid, the Prophet saw her accidently in her house through a half-open door in the absence of Zaid and was charmed with her beauty, and that when Zaid came to know of this, he divorced her for the sake of the Prophet who married her then. Not only does this false story find no support in the Holy Quran, but it is contradicted in plain words by it. If this story is true, the Prophet must be held as blameable in this matter whereas the Holy Quran says plainly that " no blame attaches to the Prophet." Secondly, the marriage would in that case be the result of his own desire or lust, but the Quran says in plain words that it was imposed by God as a duty upon the Prophet and that he was commanded to do it. The marriage is plainly called ما فرض الله له "What God appointed for the prophet " and امر الله " The command of God." Thirdly, in the Holy Quran it is stated that the Prophet enjoined Zaid not to divorce his wife, which he could not have said if he had the least desire to possess her. To say that these words came from insincere lips only proves the dishonesty and guilty conscience of the false accuser. As shown above the words " Be righteous before God and do not divorce thy wife " could not come but from the depth of a pure and sincere heart. Fourthly, it is stated in the Holy

Quran that the object of this marriage was that the false custom of adoption should be uprooted, whereas if the story were true, the object of the marriage would have been the satisfaction of the carnal desires of the Prophet and not the one stated in the Quran. Fifthly, the words in which Zaid is described in the verse under discussion also refute the story as a false one. Instead of mentioning Zaid by name, the Holy Quran says: وا ذ تقول للذ ى ا نعم ا لله عليه و ا نعمت عليه "And when thou didst say to him to whom God was gracious and to whom thou also wast gracious." In the first place Zaid is described as one of the righteous walking in the right path. We are told in the Sura *Fatiha* to pray for being guided " in the right path, the path of those to whom God has been gracious." The words انعمت عليهم used there are the exact equivalents of the words نعم ا لله عليه ا used of Zaid. Zaid is, therefore, described by God to have attained to the degree of righteousness to attain which every true Muslim should strive. Now if it be supposed that Zaid knowing of the Prophet's intention to marry his wife, divorced her for his sake, he could not be praised as one of the righteous upon whom God had showered down His favors. In such a case he ought to have been condemned as being guilty of a black deed. But the words of praise used of Zaid show clearly that he was acting righteously in the matter and following a man who was also righteous. Again, Zaid is described as one to whom the Prophet had shown favor. Now all the favors shown by the Prophet to Zaid, would have been voided if he had entertained the idea of having his wife divorced and marrying her himself. His favors would have been in that case outweighted by the wrong he would have done Zaid. In that case Zaid ought not to have been described as one who had received favors from the Prophet (as he is really) but as one who had been wronged by him. Thus every word of the Holy Quran condemns the story as false upon which the Christians rely for their false charge. It is an admitted principle with regard to traditions that every tradition, whatever may be the authority for it, should be condemned as false when it contradicts the Holy Quran. This tradition may then be rejected without any further consideration.

We will however cast a glance at the circumstances and see if the story finds any support in them. Now, in the first place it is admitted that Zainab was the Prophet's real aunt's daughter and, there

fore, the Prophet must have known her from her very childhood. Secondly, she was one of the earliest Muslims and as a member of the small society that gathered at Mecca about the Holy Prophet could not have remained unknown to, or unseen by, him. Thirdly, she was a *Muhajira* and in that capacity too, she must have been fully known to the Prophet. Fourthly, there was no seclusion of women among the Arabs, and even in Islam the order of the seclusion of women was not revealed until after the marriage of the Prophet with Zainab. Is there a grain of truth in the story that the beauty of Zainab was revealed by chance to the Prophet through a half-open door and that he was charmed with it? What a monstrous falsehood! Had not the Prophet known and seen her in her youth? Is it not moreover true that at the time of her marriage with the Prophet, Zainab was more than 35 years of age, which in the case of women is regarded as an old age in warm climates. There is another circumstance which condemns this story as false. Had such an event taken place, it would certainly have raised strong doubts in the minds of the followers of the Prophet as to his truth. Such an act which was apparently guilty could not have but brought the whole movement to utter extinction. Zaid would have been the first to apostatise, because he was aware of all the circumstances, and the scandal would have soon become public. Not a single follower could have remained with the Prophet or believed in his mission. They were bound to him by the tie of righteousness and followed him as the model of virtue. What was it for which they suffered the persecutions of their enemies, left their homes and laid down their lives for the sake of the Prophet. It was only his righteousness and their own desire to walk in his footsteps. Had any such circumstance actually happened as the Christian writers assert, they would have all dispersed. But not a single person entertained any doubt and not a single heart was subject to any misgiving. Does it not clearly show that this story is a huge falsehood devised in later ages? We may also mention that this false story is contradicted by the authentic account which we have given above, and in this manner also is its falsehood proved.

Let us now see what is the authority for this false story. Muir refers us to Tabri. Now Tabri is an historian who has tried to swell the volume of his work by narrating every event that he happened to

listen without examining it critically. The only body who took pains to sift the truth from the error in the vast mass of tradition, is that of the *Mohaddisin*. Tabri was not one of the *Mohaddisin* and in his history or commentary, we do not find a single attempt to separate truth from fiction. To judge of the truth of a tradition, therefore, we must first go to the *Mohaddisin* and they reject the false story on which the Missionaries rely. But when we examine the particular story under discussion as reported in Tabri, we are surprised at the simplicity of that historian. The same story is reported twice in Tabri with a very slight variation in the two texts. The chain of reporters is in both cases the same. Thus he says: Muhammad bin Umar reported to me that Abdulla son of Amir Aslami reported to him that Muhammad, son of Yahya, son of Habban, said that the Prophet of God . . . . ." Here it should be noted in the first instance that a writer writing in the fourth century gives only three names as reporters through whom the story came to him, and this circumstance is the first witness affirming the falsehood of this story. Let us now take the several persons reporting the story in succession. The last person to whom the story is traced is Muhammad, son of Yahya, son of Habban, who is not one of the companions and, therefore, no value can be attached to a story for which he is not a first-hand authority. The story evidently is not traced to any companion of the Holy Prophet and, therefore, must be rejected as utterly false. This Muhammad died in A. H. 121, and therefore his evidence if he really said so, cannot be admitted. From Muhammad, Abdulla, son of Amir Aslami, reports the story who died in A. H. 150, and who is described in books on the *Asmaur-Rijal* as ضعيف احد "One of the weak" and no trust can be placed in his report. He died in A. H. 150, and it is further stated that he does not report anything from Muhammad, son of Yahya, nor does Muhammad, son of Umar, report anything from him. But Tabri draws his report through this channel which is rejected by the *Mohaddisin*, and hence no weight can be attached to such a report. The last name in the chain of Tabri's reporters cannot be exactly identified with any of the men of that name in the *Asmaur-Rijal*, as Tabri has not given full particulars of that name. Moreover there is only one channel through which this report is obtained, whereas the *Mohaddisin* are never contented with the truth of report unless

it is reported through various channels, the reporters in each channel living so far from each other that a plot cannot be conceived of in their case. But the report of Tabri does not satisfy a single one of the conditions necessary for an authentic and true report and, therefore, it is dishonest to attack the Prophet of God on its strength when contrary reports admitted to be true and authentic by the *Mohaddisin* also exist.

From this it is clear that the story is quite fictitious on whose strength Mr. Monro charges the Holy Prophet, and the Holy Quran condemns the charge as false. Another consideration leads us to the conclusion which we already reached. The Arabs were a particularly jealous nation and they were men who were conscious of their own high descent and noble blood. The companions of the Prophet were not drawn from the dregs of society such as fishermen or washermen, nor were the women that followed him harlots. They were jealous and chaste people. On one occasion when the Holy Prophet was accompanying one of his wives home, two men passed by, and the Holy Prophet called them and told them that the woman he was accompanying was his wife. This he did not, because any doubt had arisen in their minds, but because he was so scrupulous as not to give any one any chance to entertain the slightest doubt with respect to his own perfect chastity. Here we observe an important difference between our own Holy Prophet and Jesus. In the Gospels it is related that in a solitary place Jesus was found talking with a woman publicly known as a harlot and he had no explanation to offer. Mark the deep insight of the Holy Prophet into human nature. He was going with his wife but still he saw that on account of the delicate relation in which he stood to his followers, it was necessary for him to tell them that it was not a strange woman he was accompanying but his own wife. Which of these two prophets stands on a higher eminence of sinlessness, it is easy to see. On the one hand is a bachelor who is in the habit of drinking wine (for such the Gospels represent him to be) talking in a solitary place with a woman who is not chaste but publicly known to be of a bad character, and he has no explanation to offer when discovered. On the other hand is a man walking with his own wife, but to dispel every doubt regarding his chastity which might possibly arise he informs the passers by that it is his wife. Can such a man who is so scru-

pulous about his chastity be reasonably charged with the guilt with which the Christian Missionaries charge him? These circumstances further show that the companions of the Prophet had reason to be certain that the Holy Prophet was perfect in his righteousness and, therefore, they did not hesitate to sacrifice their lives for his sake, while the disciples of Jesus had no reason for having a certain faith in his righteousness and in the truth of his mission and, therefore, they did not hesitate to betray him into the hands of his enemies or curse him or quit him at the moment when he needed their help. In fact, it cannot be questioned that the companions of the Holy Prophet had a perfect faith in his righteousness whereas the disciples of Jesus were devoid of such a faith. Their weakness of which we read so often in the Gospels was in fact due to the weakness of their faith in their master, while the strength of the companions of the Prophet was due to the firmness of their conviction in the righteousness of the great teacher whom they followed. Here we wish to draw Mr. Monro's attention to the character of Jesus as displayed in the story above referred to, and ask him to state honestly what would he have thought of another Prophet of God if such incidents had been related of him. While solving this question, Mr. Monro will kindly remember the opinion of Jesus' contemporaries with regard to his character and read the verse in which they state him to be a drunkard and a friend of sinners, *i. e.*, harlots.

Another verse of the Holy Quran in which Mr. Monro finds the Holy Prophet described as having committed a sin, runs as follows: انا انزلنا اليك الكتاب بالحق لتحكم بين الناس بما اراك الله ولا تكن للخائنين خصيما (النساء) "Verily we have sent down the Book to thee with truth, that thou mayest judge between men according as God has given thee insight, and for the deceitful ones be not a disputer." Perhaps the reader will be astonished that Mr. Monro was going to point out a sin but the verse does not say anything about it. Mr. Monro's argument is this that since the Prophet has been commanded not to dispute for the deceitfu ones, therefore he must have so disputed, and must have been guilty of some sin, but such an argument betrays poverty of intellect on the part of Mr. Monro. A commandment to a Prophet does not mean that he has already acted against it. This is an absur-

dity which Mr. Monro will see on a deeper reflection. Mr. Monro has also his "learned commentators" whom he blindly follows without paying any attention to the words of the Quran. If the "learned commentators" have given their own opinion, it is open to criticism; if they have stated any tradition in support of their statement, the authenticity of the tradition must first be determined. There are various versions of this story and although none of them is of the highest class of authentic traditions but the only one to which credit can be given is that adopted by Jalal-ud-din Sayooti in his *Lubab-un-Naqool fi Asbab-in-Nazool* (the essence of reports as to the occasions of revelation) on the authority of Tirmazi and Hakam and other traditionalists as reported by Qatada, son of Numan. This report is given in the following words:—Qatada says "There were some people of us, called Banu Uberik, Bashr, Bashir and Mobashshir. Now Bashr was an hypocrite who used to make verses abusing the companions of the Holy Prophet and attributing them to Arab poets saying: 'Such and such a one has said thus.' These people were in poverty in the days of ignorance as well as in Islam, and the food of the people at Medina was figs and barley. Now my uncle bought a load of bread and kept it in a saloon where he had his arms, coat of mail and sword. Some one from beneath broke into the saloon and took away the loaves as well as the arms. In the morning my uncle Rafa'h came to me and said: 'Son of my brother, we have been wronged during the night, our saloon has been broken into and the bread and arms have been taken away.' So we began to spy out in the house and on enquiry were told that the Banu Uberik had been seen kindling a light during the night and that so far as could be judged,it was kindled on some of our loaves. When we were thus inquiring, the Banu Uberak said: 'By God we believe Labid, son of Sahl, to be the thief,' a man of us who did good actions and was a Muslim. When Labid heard this, he drew the sword and said: 'I, a thief? By God, this my sword will cut you or bring forth proof of your allegation?' Then the Banu Uberak said: 'Away from us thou man, thou art not the thief?' Then we continued to inquire in the house, until there was no doubt left that the Banu Uberak were the real thieves. So my uncle said to me: 'Son of my brother, it is desirable that thou shouldst go to the Prophet of God and mention it to him.' So I went to the Prophet of God and said to him: 'There are some people in our house who broke into the house of my uncle and took away his

bread and arms. They should return to us our arms and as for the bread we have no need of it.' The Prophet of God said: 'I will look into it?' When the Banu Uberak heard this, they came to a man called Asir, son of Urwa, and talked with him on this matter. So he gathered some people of the house and they came and said to the Prophet: 'O Prophet of God, Qatada, son of Numan, and his uncle falsely charge some people of us who do good actions and are Muslims, with theft without any evidence and proof.' Then I went to the Prophet of God and he said to me: 'Oppressest thou people who are spoken of as doers of good deeds and Muslims and chargest them thou with theft without any evidence or proo?' So I came back and told my uncle, who said: 'God is the helper.' After a short while came the revelation: . . . . انا انزلنا اليك الكتب On the revelation of this verse the arms were brought to the Prophet of God and he returned them to me." Mr. Monro will kindly point out the part of this story which speaks of the alleged sin of the Holy Prophet. What the Prophet did was quite right under the circumstances. Qatada gave no proof of his assertions, and neither had he any such proof in his hands, for when the Holy Prophet said to him that he had no proof, he went away silent and his uncle also, hopeless of being able to furnish any evidence as to the truth of his assertions, only said: "God will help us." As a judge, the Prophet was wholly right in rejecting the suit of Qatada, because he did not bring forth any evidence at all. The judge has to decide a case on the evidence brought forward, and if the complainant does not produce any evidence, the complaint must be dismissed. Even if such dismissal involves a miscarriage of justice, yet it is not the judge who is to be blamed for it. The fault is at the door of the complainant and the judge acts rightly in the matter. How can the intention of the Prophet be called wrong then in the case under discussion? What folly on the part of Mr. Monro to say that the Prophet committed a sin when he intended to dismiss a suit for want of proof! Was the Divine commandment given to him that he should decide a case in favor of the party who brought forward no evidence or proof? In fact the habit of finding faults with the Prophets of God and abusing them as sinful men has led Mr. Monro to the height of absurdity, and he never thinks what he is going to say.

That in this case where no evidence for the complainant was coming forth, the Prophet would have been quite right in dismissing the

complaint, no sensible person would doubt for a moment. But the Divine revelation came at once to his assistance and in the words revealed as quoted above, there was a hint to him that the circumstances of the case required a judgment in favor of the complainant. His decision in this case proceeded upon بما اراك الله "What God had shown him." We have already stated that the words ولا تكن للخائنين خصيما do not presuppose that he had been a disputer for the fraudulent. These words of the revelation coming upon the heart of the Prophet, are in fact an image of the innermost feelings of his heart and their significance is really that the Prophet could never be a disputer for the fraudulent. Though revelation does not proceed from the heart and comes from God, yet it is granted according to the capability of the heart of its recipient and is, as it were, an image of his heart. Thus the verse under discussion is an image of the heart of the Prophet and it means in his mouth, "Almight God has sent to me the Book with truth that I may judge between men according to the insight which He has granted to me, and I will never be a disputer for the fraudulent." Every sensible person would be surprised to see a conclusion of sinfulness drawn from a verse which negatives the sinfulness of the Prophet.

To be continued.

The Epiphany on the Muslim Doctrine of Hell.

An article appears in the *Epiphany* of July 18th, signed by one W.G. of Pubna, in which an attempt has been made to prove that the Quran teaches that all men, righteous as well as sinners, shall be burned in hell, and from this supposed argument the necessity of atonement is drawn as a conclusion. The conversion of the late Dr. Imad-ud-din to Christianity is said to have been due to this teaching of the Quran. Since the Revd. gentleman is now dead we need not go into details as to the actual causes of his conversion. Even if we suppose for the sake of argument that the Quran teaches that all men whether good or bad will taste of hell-fire, the doctrine of atonement is not thereby proved. What nonsensical talk, "a savior once offered to bear the sins of many," or "God in Christ reconciling the world to himself!" How easily do these Christian Missionaries kick at reason and sense when talking of

atonement. Mr. W. G. sneers at the explanation that " by the power of their faith the fire would be extinguished," but he finds no objection to the absurd doctrine that Jesus took away the sins of the world. Such a doctrine is simply meant to open the door to licentiousness, and finding it difficult to purify their own lives, these gentlemen send their God in Christ to hell. Supposing that the Muhammadan doctrine requires all men to go to hell, the Christian doctrine only adds to its horribleness by sending even God to hell. If Mr. W. G. offers the explanation that God went to hell to save men, why should he object to some good men going to hell to save their brethren.

But let us examine the Quranic teaching. From the earliest times the Muslims have never held that the righteous will be burned in hell-fire. The verse وَإِنْ مِنْكُمْ إِلَّا وَارِدُهَا " No one is there of you who shall not go to it " is to be read with the verse : إِنَّ الَّذِينَ سَبَقَتْ

" Verily they for whom we have before ordained the good reward shall be far away from it (*i. e.*, hell-fire) ; its slightest sound they shall not hear, and in that which their souls longed for, shall they abide for ever. The great terror shall not trouble them and the angels shall meet them with glad tidings." Are plainer words required to prove that in the verse under discussion the Quran does not mean that the righteous will be burned in hell-fire ? The fact that the righteous shall remain far away from hell and shall, therefore, never see it, that they shall never hear its slightest sound, and that the great terror shall not trouble them and they shall, therefore, never feel any torment, being established by plain words of the Holy Quran, the commentators are at liberty to explain the verse under discussion in any way that seems best to them, so long as this fact is not contradicted. It is folly to call these explanations "attempts to get over an awkward difficulty." The verse, of the Quran must be interpreted in a way which should reconcile its various parts to one another. When the Holy Quran says plainly that the righteous shall never see hell, that they shall never hear its sound, and that they shall never feel its torment, the honest critic ought to pause there and think what he is going to say. But the Christian Missionary has never been known to be a fair critic when attacking other religions. He is too partial to his own and too hostile to others. He need not defer to the opinions of the commentators, but he is bound to pay due attention to the words of

the Quran. By referring to the verse quoted above, he can at once see that whatever meaning be attached to the words وان منكم الا واردها it is established beyond the shadow of a doubt that they do not signify that the righteous shall ever see hell-fire, or hear its sound or feel its torment. If the interpreter has here before him a difficulty and he solves it as seems to him best, this or that Revd. gentleman has no business to interfere. Is the Bible without such difficulties? If Mr. W.G. has an answer in the affirmative, we shall quote as many instances as can satisfy him.

We will now examine the words of the verse under discussion. It says: وان منكم الا واردها "No one is there of you who shall not go to it." In the first place, therefore, it is necessary to see who are the persons included in "you." Is it the whole of mankind, or the faithful only or the unbelievers only? The correspondent of the *Epiphany* seems to take the word to mean the Muslims only and thus excludes even the unbelievers. He says: "The word for hell used in the context here is جهنم which is the technical term used by Muslim theologians for the purgatorial hell in which Muslims must expiate their crimes by their sufferings before being made partakers of the bliss of heaven." Then he says that the Quran teaches seven divisions of hell but he names only six of them. As a matter of fact the six names جحيم, سعير, حطمة, لظى, خهنم, and هاوية are only six different names of hell mentioned in the Quran and none of these is there described as a division of hell for a particular class of unbelievers. We do not wish to say anything more concerning these six names (the seventh of course the Christian correspondent does not mention, perhaps he has reserved it for himself) as these Missionaries are never ashamed of their ignorance of the Quran. The point to which we wish to draw the reader's attention is this that Mr. W. G. is clever enough to say that in the verse under discussion, the Muslims only are meant as جهنم only which according to him is the purgatorial hell for Muslims is mentioned in the context and the other divisions mentioned by him to contain the Christians, Jews, Magi, idolators and hypocrites are not named, showing that these unbelievers are not included in the address. Mr. W. G. has thus proved from the Holy Quran that God has declared it to be obligatory upon Him to send every Muslim to hell, whereas He has never declared it to be obligatory upon Him to send every unbeliever to hell. The conclusion then to which Mr. W. G. comes is that the Quran says that every Muslim must go to hell whereas the unbelievers may be saved. An

excellent temptation to unbelievers to accept the religion of Islam! Mr. W. G. seems to be the ablest Christian Missionary that has visited the Indian soil. How would the Christian religion have obtained this glorious victory over Islam if W. G. had never come to India. Bless the fates, ye Christian Missionaries, that such able men are still among you!

Such are the vagaries of Mr. W.G., but let us now look at facts. The Quran itself informs us what it means by "you." If we go a few verses backward, we find ويقول الانسان ءاذا ما مت لسوف اخرج حيا "And says man: 'What! After I am dead, shall I indeed be brought forth alive?'" Does every man say this? The Prophet did not say it, and his companions did not say it. Who is this الانسان then? It is the denier of the day of judgment, the denier of the Prophet in fact. After this the Holy Quran says:—"And I swear by the Lord, We will surely gather together them (*i. e.*, the unbelievers) and the Satans (who misled them): then surely will We set them on their knees round the hell. (Mark that the believers are not included). Then will We surely take forth from every band those of them who have been stoutest in proud rebellion against the merciful; then shall We know right well to whom its burning is most due (*i. e.*, the severity of punishment to the unbelievers and deniers of the day of judgment will be proportional to the hardness of their hearts." Here follows the verse under discussion, and the context settles conclusively that the "you" in this verse means only the persons already spoken of. These are the same persons who have already been spoken of as having been gathered round hell-fire on their knees. To them it is said that as they are sure that they shall not be raised again and that there shall be no day of judgment and no punishment of evil deeds, so it is a settled decree with the Lord that they shall go to hell and that this punishment of their evil deeds shall certainly be awarded to them.

Some objections remain to be answered. It is stated that this verse is followed by ثم ننجى الذين اتقوا which is translated "Afterwards will We deliver those who feared God." But ثم does not always mean "Afterwards." It is sometimes placed in the beginning when something quite new is brought before the reader. Thus in *Sura Alanam*, an account of the Holy Prophet and the unbelievers is followed by the verse ثم آتينا موسى الكتب which no sensible per-

son will translate into "Afterwards we gave Moses a Book." ثم therefore, does not always mean "Afterwards," but sometimes it is used to begin a new sentence. The word ننجی does not imply that they will be delivered after suffering the torments of hell-fire, but it only means that they shall be saved from hell-fire. This use of the word is exemplified on various occasions in the Holy Quran. The angels say to Lot انا لمنجوک It does not mean that he will partake of the torture and then be delivered from it, but that he shall be quite safe. To draw from the words ونذر الظالمین فیها جثیا "And We shall leave the ungodly therein on their knees," the conclusion that the righteous will not be left therein and that, therefore, they must be thrown into hell and then taken out of it, defies all principles of logic. The fact is that here the two parties, the righteous and the ungodly, are mentioned side by side and contrasted. The one class is saved from hell while the other is down upon its knees in it. Instances of this abound in the Holy Quran. In this very *Sura* we have after a few verses یوم نحشر المتقین الی الرحمن وفدا ونسوق المجرمین الی جهنم وردا "On that day We will gather the righteous unto the God of mercy with honors due, and drive the sinners into hell like flocks driven to the watering." Again in *Sura Zumar* we read وسیق الذین کفروا الی جهنم زمرا وسیق الذین اتقوا ربهم الی الجنة زمرا . . . "And the unbelievers shall be driven towards hell by troops, ... and the righteous shall be driven on in troops to paradise." The same contrast is brought out here again and it is plainly stated that the righteous and the ungodly shall be driven in two different directions, the one to heaven and the other to hell. The righteous, therefore, cannot go to hell.

Lastly, we have no hesitation in saying that even if "you" in the verse under discussion be taken to mean the whole mankind, the interpretations adopted by learned Muslim theologians are not in the least objectionable. But we advise the Christian Missionaries to make themselves acquainted with the contents of the Holy Qurán before finding faults with it. The doctrine of atonement will not stand on the feeble props on which they want to support it. Some reasonable explanation must be given of it to satisfy the seekers after truth. Misrepresentations and abuses will not succeed in the end.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. II.] SEPTEMBER, 1903. [No. 9.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده و نصلي على رسوله الكريم

A Review of Christianity from a New Point of View.

(By the Promised Messiah.)

TRINITY.

THE advocates of Christianity rely for salvation on two dogmas solely, *viz.*, the sinlessness of Jesus and atonement through his blood. Salvation according to them is the necessary and sole result of the belief that Jesus, son of Mary, was the Son of God and, therefore, free from sins, and that he died on the cross for the salvation of mankind. But the days are gone when people could find any consolation in these erroneous doctrines which are the invention of some ingenious brain. The hidden eyes of truth are now fast opening and no power can close them. It would have been much better if these people had themselves bid farewell to the antiquated doctrines of Trinity and Atonement and not opposed the mighty host of truths that is coming down from heaven. It is surprising indeed that even in this age of reason the Christian Missionaries have the boldness to preach these childish doctrines which on account of their absurdity are rejected by every sensible person.

We will however see how the Jews regard these doctrines, because their ancient sacred books are the Christian's only authority for deifying a weak mortal. The inheritance of the Bible belongs to the Jews, and as such their teaching on this point carries the greatest weight. Now these people have always declared with one voice, without there being a single dissenting schism, that the doctrines of Incarnation and Atonement are utterly opposed to the Word of God. Their hatred

for these innovations of the Christians is boundless. It is moreover easily conceivable that if the Jews had really been taught through an unbroken chain of continuously rising prophets and through successive revelations from the Almighty that they had not one God but three Gods of whom the son of Mary was one, they could not have all in one voice rejected this plain and simple teaching just at the time when the expected God had come to them, and the whole nation would not have thus entirely agreed on this denial. Can we imagine that for fourteen hundred years the Jews adhered firmly to the doctrine that there are three Gods and that salvation can never be obtained except through the blood of Jesus, but that upon the appearance of Jesus they all denied this time-honored doctrine in the most emphatic words? Does it not make us wonder that a doctrine that had through long centuries sunk into the very blood of the Israelites was all of a sudden so utterly blotted out from their memories? It was possible that they should have denied the Divinity of the son of Mary, but it was impossible that they should have altogether lost the very expectation of the advent of such a God. If they did not recognise the Promised God in the person of Jesus, they ought to have at least waited for some one else who being born of a woman should have been one of the three Gods. It was in no case possible that they should have all at once given up the central and most emphatic doctrine of all the books which had been impressed upon the hearts of every generation through fourteen centuries by successive revelation and consecutively rising prophets, and unanimously adopted the contrary teaching of the unity of God which agrees with the teaching of the Holy Quran on this point. Can any sensible person entertain the idea for a moment that the doctrine that there were three Gods of whom one was Jesus who was to be born from a woman named Mary, is contained in the books of the Old Testament, that it was taught by Moses or any other prophet rising after him to his people, or that it was taught by any Jewish school? If we admit this, we must repudiate every historic fact whose truth is palpably manifest. The evidence which the Jewish writings and Jewish commentaries furnish establishes clearly that the Jews always adhered to the plain and simple doctrine that God is alone and without a partner, that He is not subject to birth and death and that whoever is born of a woman can never be God. But where are the books to be met with in which the prophets taught the doct-

rine of Trinity to the Israelites, and where are we to find the Jewish writings bearing evidence that Trinity was ever taught them? The current books and writings have no trace of any such teaching. How was the doctrine then swept off from the face of the earth and blotted out from the memories of all men notwithstanding that there had been no break in the appearance of the Divine messengers, from Moses the great law-giver to John the Baptist who was preaching the same doctrine at the advent of Jesus of Nazareth. The prime duty of all these successive prophets rising among the Jews was only to preserve in entire purity the doctrine relating to the person of the Divine Being, the doctrine upon which hung the salvation of mankind. How did they discharge that duty if instead of the doctrine of Trinity, they taught a strikingly contradictory doctrine which attained a world-wide fame to the utter extinction of the doctrine which from the Christian standpoint it was their chief duty to preach.

From all this it is clear that the teaching which has been the glorious inheritance of Israel and which has, therefore, taken entire hold of the national mind of that people is pure monotheism. To the simple unitarian faith the Jews are even now wholly devoted, and in spite of the long and painful persecutions, they have suffered at the hands of the Christians, they assert this to this day. The learned Jewish Ribbies from whom we have personally made enquiries, regard Trinity as a blasphemy and depose that they have always been guided by the light of monotheism. In interpreting the doctrinal part of the Pentateuch and other Books of the Old Testament, we are bound to follow the meaning attached to such teachings by the Jewish Ribbies from the oldest times, as being imbued with the spirit of the law, they could best understand it. It is possible, rather probable, that they erred in determining the object of some of the prophecies relating to the appearance of future prophets, for generally there are no details in prophecies and a certain obscurity always attaches to their meaning. Nay, even the prophet who announces the prophecies is sometimes unable to give their details in full, for the prophecy relates to the unseen, and its full comprehension is not given to any individual. Its full knowledge remains with God only until the time of its fulfilment and Almighty God is not bound to disclose all its particulars before the fixed time. Its full particulars are revealed only upon its fulfilment,

and, therefore, there is often a liability to error in the comprehension of its exact meaning and full particulars before its time. Such is not however the case with the fundamental dogmas of a religion upon which depends the salvation of mankind. It is the most important duty of a prophet to explain them fully and not to leave them vague and obscure. The prophets of God have, therefore, always laid the greatest stress upon this part of their teachings. To effect this very object, numerous prophets rising successively were sent to the Israelites, so that by their frequent injunctions and explanations, the impress of the fundamental doctrine of the unity of God may leave a permanent mark on their hearts.

If the current Gospels accepted by the Church are to be believed, it will appear from them that Jesus has numbered himself with the sons of God. Setting aside for the present the question of the incredibility of the Gospels on account of the corruption which they have undergone and which lowers their value in the eyes of impartial critics to little more than waste paper, it will be seen that such a title for a prophet of God in the terminology of prophetic language was no novelty and that Jesus was not the first recepient of such a title. The Israelite prophets were generally honored with this title. There is not a single peculiarity about Jesus, nor did he work a single miracle which might afford the slightest evidence of his Divinity. On the other hand, we find in him all the frailties and weaknesses of human nature which are met with in other men. Death is the chief sign of mortality, and Jesus by his death proved conclusively that he was nothing more than a mortal. It is folly to take him for God even after his death, for reason repels the idea that God should die. Moreover when according to the Christian doctrine the three Gods are one, it is impossible that one of the Gods should die while the other two live. Nay, the death of one involves the death of the other two. It is moreover inconceivable that one who is really the son of God should declare his absolute ignorance of the day of judgment. Is such ignorance and lack of knowledge compatible with Divinity?

JESES DID NOT DIE UPON THE CROSS.

We give below a few reasons briefly indicating the falsehood of

the supposed resurrection and ascension of Jesus and showing that he did not die upon the cross.

Firstly, the Gospel itself furnishes clear evidence that Jesus did not die upon the cross. Two occasions require to be specially noticed. In one place Jesus compares his own story to the story of Jonas. He further calls Jonas' story a sign. Now it is admitted that Jonas did not die in the belly of the whale nor was he dead when swallowed by it. Therefore, if it is supposed that Jesus was dead when put into the sepulchre, his case bore no resemblance to that of Jonas. This illustration furnished by Jesus himself as expressive of his own condition affords the clearest and most conconclusive evidence that Jesus did not die upon the cross, but to see it the veil of prejudice and habit must be drawn aside. It shows clearly that he was taken down alive from the cross and that he was put alive into his sepulchre, for Jonas also was alive when swallowed by the whale. The disaster that befell Jonas was the result of his prophecy against his people, the prophecy being to the effect that punishment and severe torture would overtake them in forty days. But as the torture did not come within the promised time, Jonas felt a severe shock thinking that the people would say that his prophecy turned out to be false. Therefore, fearing the cavillings of his people he fled to another land. In the case of Jesus similar events happened. He also announced a prophecy to his people but it was not fulfilled. He had told them that he would inherit the throne of David, establish a temporal kingdom and rule over Israel. But he had a misconception with respect to the actual meaning of the words of the prophecy and, therefore, according to his interpretation the prophecy was not fulfilled, but turned out to be untrue. At this his grief was great, and he was thinking of flying to another country like Jonas, for in the Gospels he is reported to have said : "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country." (Matt. 13: 57), but before he had made any preparation to quit the country, he was seized by the Jews and nailed to the cross. But as the similarity with Jonas shows, Almighty God saved him from death and on account of his righteousness listened to his prayer to which he had given utterance in the garden on the previous night. Now he had a good opportunity to fulfil the desire of his heart and, therefore, he went away from

that country in disguise in search of the lost sheep of Israel living in distant countries. It was for this reason that he was called يسوع اسف *Yasu' Asaf*, *Yasu* being the Hebrew name of Jesus, and *Asaf* meaning the searcher of his lost people. The word يسوع اسف ultimately took the form of يوز اسف *Yus Asaf*, and under this name Jesus is known to this day. In short, the resemblance of Jesus to Jonas on which he himself laid great stress, was this that he was put into the sepulchre alive, as Jonas was swallowed by the whale alive, and that he fled from his people to another country as Jonas also fled to another country. If this resemblance between Jesus and Jonas is rejected, the words of Jesus shall have to be condemned as false, and instead of resemblance between the two prophets we will have an apparent dissimilitude. If resemblance is admitted, the conclusion is evident that Jesus did not die upon the cross.

The second argument which the Gospels furnish on the point that Jesus did not die upon the cross, is to be met with in his prayer in the garden which he offered up to the Almighty with humble supplication and with strong crying and tears, a full account of which is given in the Gospels. It is inconceivable that a righteous man like Jesus should have prayed the whole night long and offered his supplications with loud cries and with weeping and in deep agony and the prayer should have been rejected. Now the object of Jesus' prayer was only to be saved from the cross, for the object of the Jewish religious leaders in crucifying him was to convince the masses that Jesus was not a righteous man, but one of the false prophets who are under the curse of God and that, therefore, he died the accursed death on the cross. It was on account of this that Jesus was so sorrowful, "sorrowful unto death" as the Gospels say. It was the accursed death on the cross that he feared and to be saved from which he prayed the whole night long, for death alone was no object of terror to him. All these circumstances rendered it necessary that Almighty God should have accepted the prayer of Jesus for his safety. His prayer was accordingly listened to and he was saved. This is plainly stated in Paul's letter to Hebrews which forms part of the sacred Canon. "He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared." (Heb. 5: 7). The words "offered up

prayers . . . . . unto him that was *able to save him from death*" are very expressive. This prayer, we are further told, was *heard*, because Jesus was one of those who feared God. What is the meaning of this prayer "to him that was able to save him from death" being heard, except that Jesus was saved from death. Jesus' prayer in the garden to be saved from death was, therefore, accepted by God and the conclusion is evident that Jesus did not die upon the cross. We are surprised at the poverty of intelligence of the Christians who uphold a theory which is directly opposed to the plain words of New Testament. If the words of Heb. 5: 7 have any meaning, there is no doubt that Jesus' prayer in the garden was accepted and he was saved from death on the cross.

Jesus was seen alive after the event of crucifixion and this is the third argument drawn from the pages of the Gospels demonstrating that Jesus did not die upon the cross. After being taken down from the cross, he was seen by his disciples, showed them his wounds and accompanied them to Galilee. Reason and common sense are both against the theory that Jesus rose from the dead. Rising from the dead is an event which is in itself quite incredible and its occurrence is improbable in the highest degree, and the feeble evidence that is produced from the Gospels is altogether inadequate to prove it. In the absence of such exceptionally strong evidence, as is necessary to prove a rare and incredible occurrence of this sort, it is much more probable under the circumstances that Jesus swooned and recovered than that after lying for three days among the dead and having actually died, he came to life again. Reason guides us to this only that he did not die upon the cross and this is highly probable under the circumstances, as history has recorded many events when people were taken down alive from the cross after having been nailed to it for much longer periods than Jesus was. To reject the reasonable and probable alternative and to follow the absurd and incredible one, shows hatred of truth and love of ignorance. Had Jesus been re-animated, he would not have shown any fear of the people, for the God who raised him from the dead, would have also saved him from his enemies, and having once seen this wonderful display of God's power, his faith in Him would have been very great. But after the crucifixion we find Jesus betraying even greater timidity and fear

of the Jews than previously. He trembled with fear lest he should again fall into their hands and forbade his disciples to tell any one that he was alive, lest the Jews hearing of it should again seize him. And wonder of wonders that God raised Jesus from the dead, but He was not able to heal his wounds, and to effect this purpose resort was at last had to the ointment which is to this day known as the Ointment of Jesus.

In the Ointment of Jesus we have the fourth evidence showing that Jesus did not die upon the cross. A recipe of this ointment is to be found in over a thousand books of medicine written by men of different languages such as Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian, ranging over a period extending to the second century after Jesus. With regard to this ointment these authorities on medicine write that the ointment was prepared for Jesus by his apostles. It is also stated in these books on medicine that this ointment is very useful in cases of hurt and external injuries, that it heals the wounds and stops the flow of blood. It is clear from this that this ointment had been prepared for the wounds of Jesus which he had received on the cross. The weight of evidence drawn from this source can hardly be over-estimated for it is found not in religious books but in scientific works, and thousands of the physicians of every nationality and creed attest to its truth.

The Gospel of Nicodemus also affords an evidence that Jesus did not die upon the cross. In the tenth chapter of the English translation of this book, we read the following story: "The soldiers answering said to the Jews, '. . . . . We have heard that ye shut up Joseph, who buried the body of Jesus, in a chamber, under a lock which was sealed; and when ye opened it, found him not there. Do ye then produce Joseph whom ye put under guard in the chamber, and we will produce Jesus whom we guarded in the sepulchre.' The Jews answered and said: 'We will produce Joseph, do ye produce Jesus. But Joseph is in his own city of Arimathaea.' The soldiers replied: 'If Joseph be in Arimathaea, and Jesus in Galilee'." From this it appears that Jesus did not die upon the cross but fled to Galilee after being taken down from the cross. The Gospel of Nicodemus is not alone in this matter, for the canonical Gospels also state that after coming out of the grave, Jesus went away to Galilee. It is

simply absurd to reject a probable and reasonable explanation of the circumstances related in the Gospels, an explanation which is the evident and direct conclusion of those circumstances, and to adopt one which is quite incredible and unnatural. With the evidence of the Gospels before him, no reasonable person would say that the probable conclusion from them is that Jesus rose from the dead. The probable conclusion from such evidence is that Jesus did not die upon the cross and there is not the slightest evidence to oppose this conclusion. Nay, there is positive evidence that he did not die. Not a single circumstance that could have certainly produced death can be pointed out. He was not kept on the cross for a sufficiently long interval to cause death nor were his legs broken. The conclusion then that he did not die upon the cross, has nothing unnatural about it. But his death upon the cross is wonderful, nay, incredible, under these circumstances, for it cannot be reasonably supposed that a man should die upon the cross within two or three hours. Not a single instance is to be met with in history that a man should have died upon the cross so soon without crurifragium.

Whatever be the opinion of the apologists as to the difference between God and man, reasonably we are entitled to presume that a god should have required a longer interval to breathe his last under sufferings than a man. But how was it that men required several days to die on the cross while god who with his strong power had come to save the world, expired only in a few hours! Apologists, of course, will say that though he was a god, yet the weight of the sins of the whole world made him powerless and weak, and he was unable to bear that heavy burden and that this was the reason of his dying so soon. But here again the judgment of the critic must go against Jesus, for if he was unable to bear the heavy burden of the sins of the world, why did he put forth such an extravagant claim and say that he would redeem the whole world of its sins by bearing them himself. It is a pity that he came to conquer sin, but sin at last conquered him and vanquished him, so that under the burden of sins he died suddenly. Since in this contest between Jesus and sins, the sins came off victorious, the power of sin was, therefore, mightier than that of Jesus who died in their clutch like a weak child who cannot sustain the slightest injury but dies of it. How wonderful that sins vanquished god and destroyed him in three hours. To believe and trust

in such a weak god, whose weakness was the cause of his death, is a great misfortune indeed. Such is the curious doctrine to which the Christian Missionaries adhere. But Jesus is said to have been seen ten times after the crucifixion as is related in the Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. 13, and he remained upon the cross only for three hours. This shows clearly that he came down alive from the cross.

The sixth argument on this point is to be found in the evidence of some Christian sects and many learned Bible scholars belonging to the Christian religion. There are some Christian sects that admit that Jesus did not die upon the cross and that his second advent will be like that of Elias, *viz.*, that it would be spiritual and not personal. They hold that the prophecy of the second advent of Jesus will be fulfilled by the appearance of a person in the spirit and character of Jesus as the prophecy of the second advent of Elias was fulfilled by the appearance of John in the spirit and power of Elias. In the same manner, a school of German critics holds that Jesus did not die upon the cross. Strauss thus sums up their views : " Crucifixion they maintain, even if the feet as well as the hands are supposed to have been nailed, occasions but very little loss of blood. It kills, therefore, only very slowly by convulsions produced by the straining of the limbs or by gradual starvation. So if Jesus, supposed indeed to be dead, had been taken down from the cross after about six hours, there is every probability of his supposed death having been only a death-like swoon, from which after the descent from the cross Jesus recovered again in the cool cavern, covered as he was with healing ointments and strongly scented spices. On this head, it is usual to appeal to an account in Josephus who says that on one occasion, when he was returning from a military recognisance, on which he had been sent, he found several Jewish prisoners who had been crucified. He saw among them three acquaintances whom he begged Titus to give to him. They were immediately taken down and carefully attended to. One was really saved but two others could not be recovered." (A new life of Jesus, by D. F. Strauss, Vol. I, page 410). Similarly in " Modern Doubt and Christian Belief" we read : " The former of these hypotheses, that of apparent death, was employed by the old rationalists, and more recently by Schleiermacher in his life of Christ." It is then stated that Schleiermacher

held the view that Jesus after his descent from the cross "lived for a time with the disciples and then retired into entire solitude for his second death." Again in "Supernatural Religion," page 875, it is stated: "The first explanation adopted by some able critics, is that Jesus did not really die on the cross, but, being taken down alive, and his body being delivered to friends, he subsequently revived. In support of this theory it is argued that Jesus is represented by the Gospels as expiring after having been but three to six hours upon the cross, which would have been an unprecedentedly rapid death. It is affirmed that only the hands and not the feet were nailed to the cross. The crurifragium, not usually accompanying crucifixion, is dismissed as unknown to the three synoptists, and only inserted by the fourth evangelist for dogmatic reasons, and, of course, the lance-thrust disappears with the leg-breaking. Thus the apparent death was that profound faintness which might well fall upon such an organization after some hours of physical and mental agony on the cross, following the continued strain and fatigue of the previous night. As soon as he had sufficiently recovered it is supposed that Jesus visited his disciples a few times to re-assure them, but with precaution on account of the Jews, and was by them believed to have risen from the dead, as indeed he himself may likewise have supposed, reviving as he had done from the faintness of death.* Seeing however that his death had set the crown upon his work, the master withdrew into impenetrable obscurity, and was heard of no more." Renan also has a few remarks on this point. He says: "It is certain indeed that doubts arose as to the reality of the death of Jesus. A few

* "Gfrorer who maintains the theory of a Scheintod with great ability, thinks that Jesus had believers amongst the rulers of Jews, who although they could not shield him from the opposition against him, still hoped to save him from death. Joseph, *a rich man*, found the means of doing so. He prepared the new sepulchre close to the place of execution, to be at hand, begged the body from Pilate——the immense quality of spices bought by Nicodemus being merely to distract the attention of the Jews—and Jesus being quickly carried to the sepulchre, was restored to life by their efforts. He interprets the famous verse John XX: 17, curiously. The expression, "I have not yet ascended to my father," etc., he takes as meaning simply the act of dying—"going to heaven"; and the reply of Jesus is equivalent to: "Touch me not, for I am still flesh and blood—I am not yet dead." Jesus sees his disciples only a few times mysteriously, and believing that he had set the final seal to the truth of his work by his death, he then retires into impenetrable gloom (*Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*, page 107 f., page 231 f.)."

hours' suspension on the cross appeared to persons in the habit of seeing crucifixions quite insufficient to bring about such a result. They quoted many instances of crucified persons, who, having been removed in time, had been restored to life by powerful remedies. Origen, at a later date, thought it necessary to invoke miracle in order to explain so sudden an end. The same surprise is to be found in the narrative of Mark." (Life of Jesus, page 269).

THE TOMB OF JESUS AT SIRINAGAR.

After noticing briefly the evidence drawn from the Gospels and that furnished by the Ointment of Jesus and the medical works containing it, to the effect that Jesus did not die upon the cross, we will now consider a very important evidence showing that after being delivered from the cross, Jesus did not go up to heaven but went to some other country. Before citing it however, we wish to draw the reader's attention to the absurdity of the story of the ascension of Jesus. A thinking mind is repelled at the idea that Jesus either before or after his crucifixion went up to heaven and rejects the story as evidently false. It is a strict Divine law prevailing in the world that no one can go up to heaven or come down from there with this body of clay. This Divine law finds an illustration in the story of Elias. It was necessary that Elias should have come down from heaven before the appearance of Jesus and it was the chief sign by which the true Messiah was to be distinguished from the false claimants. But Jesus himself was obliged to take the words of Malachi speaking of the bodily descent of Elijah, in a spiritual sense, and to state that his second advent was to be taken only metaphorically. How are we to understand then that the ascension and descent of Jesus are to be taken literally? The Word of God is against such a supposition, and there is not a single instance of any bodily ascent or descent since the creation of the world. On the other hand, we have the authority of Jesus himself that such statements are to be taken metaphorically. To persist in such a course is to walk in the path of destruction. It is moreover absurd to suppose that a prophet should leave his work incomplete to take rest in heaven. In the Gospels Jesus ad-

mits that he has other sheep, and it was, therefore, his duty to deliver the message to them. The reference in this passage is really to the Israelite nations who did not live in the centre but had settled abroad in distant countries, and whom it was his duty to invite to the right path. After being delivered from the cross it was, therefore, his bounden duty to inform of his advent those Israelite nations who were yet quite ignorant of the appearance of the Messiah. These tribes had very early settled in different parts of India and especially in Cashmere. Jesus, who himself had stated it to be his duty to go to the scattered sheep of the house of Israel and preach to them the Word of God, could not go to heaven before he had completely discharged his duty. A righteous man shudders at the idea of ascribing such a grave sin to Jesus as that he went up to heaven before discharging his duties completely. Nor can we attribute such an absurd and nonsensical transaction to Almighty God that He should take away a living man who has the capacity to do good deeds and who can do important service and great benefit to his fellow-beings, and seat him on heaven suspending him from the exercise of his ministry and of the important functions thereof. Is it not equivalent to the infliction of solitary imprisonment upon the man? Was it not far better for Jesus to spend all those long years of his life in the service of mankind, and in doing good to his dispersed people, tracing their footsteps in the different lands in which they had settled. Only in this case would he have deserved the glorious title of the "Travelling prophet" which is usually given to him. What for did he go up to heaven, leaving his important duties of ministry undischarged, when he knew his people to be involved in serious errors? What was the fault of the poor Israelites who had waited his appearance for generations, and who were yet quite ignorant of it? Why did he leave them in the dark and not offer them his helping hand?

We will now consider the evidence which shows that travelling through different countries Jesus came to Cashmere at last, and passing the rest of his days there was buried after his death in the Khan Yar Street of that city. We learn from the united testimony of Christians as well as Muhammadans that Yus Asaf was the name of a prophet whose time is exactly the same as that of Jesus and who

came to Cashmere after a long journey. He was not only known as a *Nabi* (prophet) but also as a *Shahzada* (prince). It is moreover stated that he came from Syria, the country in which Jesus lived. His teachings also have a striking resemblance with the teachings of Jesus, so much so that some of the parables and phrases of his book are the same as those which are still to be met with in the Gospels. These facts and similarities are so striking that even the Christians have been obliged to admit that the person who went under the name of Yus Asaf and prince-prophet was one of the followers of Jesus. It is for this reason that he is held in such great honor, and a church has been erected in honor of his name in Sicily. It was also on account of the close resemblance of Yus Asaf with Jesus that the story of Yus Asaf was translated into almost all the languages of Europe and read so vastly. The zeal with which Christian Europe worked and the interest which it took in spreading the story of Yus Asaf, is in itself a strong evidence that if the Christians never recognised the actual identity of these two personages, they at least admitted a strong and close connection between them and took Yus Asaf for a disciple of Jesus if not for Jesus himself. Taking all these facts into consideration, *viz.*, that Yus Asaf has (as admitted by the Christians themselves) a very close connection with Christianity, that his time is the same as the time of Jesus, that his life and teachings were translated with an ardent zeal into the different languages of Europe, that a church was erected in his memory, that the moral teachings of Yus Asaf are admitted to have much in common with those of Jesus, and that Yus Asaf called his book *Bushra* or Gospel like Jesus, every unprejudiced mind will be of opinion that Yus Asaf was no other than Jesus himself. If the Christians cannot accept him on this evidence as the same prophet Jesus, who is known as Jesus of Nazareth, the burden of proof lies on them to show that any disciple of Jesus was known as a prince-prophet or that any one of his disciples ever represented the teachings of Jesus as being his own and called them his own Gospel. Such a proof is however far from being in their hands, for none, but Jesus, son of Mary, was ever called *Shazada-Nabi* or prince-prophet.

Of the books relating to the story of Yus Asaf, the Muhammadans have some books which were written over a thousand years ago.

One of these is "Ikmal-ud-din" which gives the story at length and in which it is also stated that Yus Asaf called his book *Bushra* or the Gospel. Besides this book, there are some other books and writings to be found at Srinagar where the tomb of Yus Asaf is situated, in which it is written that this prophet (*i.e.*, the prophet who lies buried in the Khan Yar street of Srinagar) who went under the name of Yus Asaf and was also called *Isa-nabi* (or Jesus, the prophet) and *Shahzada-nabi* or prince-prophet, was one of the Israelite prophets who came to Kashmir about 1600 years before these books were written or about 1900 years before our time. The Muhammadan residents of Kashmir are not the only depositaries of these books, but it is also said that the Hindus also have a book relating the story of Yus Asaf in their own language. With this evidence before him a seeker after truth must reach the conclusion that the tomb of Yus Asaf at Sirinagar is the tomb of none but Jesus himself, especially when he considers the combined force of this evidence. There is the Gospel which leads us to the conclusion that Jesus did not die upon the cross but that he was only in a swoon. To this Jesus himself bore witness when he said that he would show to the Jews the sign of Jonas the prophet. If he died on the cross, and it was his dead body that was put into the grave, his circumstances had not the least resemblance to the circumstances of the prophet Jonas. The Gospels moreover inform us that he came out of his grave alive, that his wounds had not yet been healed, that he met his disciples but forbade them to inform the Jews of the matter, that then he went away to Galilee his native land in their company, and that with them he partook of food. Such is the testimony of the Christian Scriptures. Along with this is to be considered the evidence of medical works whose united testimony shows that an ointment which is to this day known after the name of Jesus and his apostles, was prepared by the latter for the wounds of the former, and its use healed his wounds. But as Jesus feared that the Jews would again seize him, he left that country and went away to some other place. This is not only our opinion but more than fifty thoughtful German critics of the Bible have held the same view. Besides these there are other ancient writings showing that Jesus lived for a long time after the event of crucifixion, and travelled in far and distant lands, this

being the reason of his being known as a travelling prophet. This is admitted by the Muhammadans for they believe that after being entrusted with his mission, Jesus travelled in different lands for a long time. From all these facts the conclusion is evident that Jesus did not at all rise to heaven as is generally supposed by his followers. Moreover as the occurrence of these facts is probable, being according to the ordinary course of nature, so, on the other hand, the ascension to heaven is improbable in the highest degree as it is quite incredible and contradicts our unvarying experience. The events we have described are acceptable to reason while the Christian theory is repelled by it. There is no ground for rejecting that which is not only probable in its occurrence but is actually proved by strong evidence, and accepting a dogma whose occurrence is not only not proved by any trustworthy evidence but is also improbable in the highest degree.

Finally, we wish to say a few words to the Editor of the *Halal*, a Christian Arabic Magazine which denies the burial of Jesus at Sirinagar in its issue of April 1903, No. 11. It is neither just nor reasonable that facts which have been demonstrated to be true, should be rejected only from religious prejudice. The Editor's rejection of the facts narrated by us is the more surprising when we see him admitting that Yus Asf was in fact a prince and prophet who is mentioned by that name in ancient documents, and that he had come to Kashmir from some other distant country. The truth is that the story of Jesus' ascension to heaven is so plainly absurd that no evidence is required to disprove it. Even if the evidence and facts which we have stated above, had not been stated, the judgment of reason would have been against the ascension of Jesus. He showed all the weaknesses which are the common share of humanity, and on many occasions he was beaten by the Jews. When the devil told him to cast himself down from the pinnacle, he could not do it and thus gave proof of his powerlessness. He did not show a single quality or any power which should entitle him to be ranked as superhuman. Nay, many of the prophets worked mightier miracles than he. Where are we to find the necessary amount of conclusive evidence and the convincing arguments show-

ing that he did in fact rise to heaven and that he is alive there to the present moment. Even if such a thing as ascension to heaven had been possible, such a step on his part was improper and unjustifiable. He had not yet fulfilled his mission and was far from having completely discharged the duties entrusted to him. There were many Jewish tribes dispersed in other countries who had not yet heard even the name of their Messiah and to whom it was Christ's duty to deliver the message. We are not aware if any Jewish tribe had settled in the heavens for whose reformation it was necessary for Jesus to traverse the aerial regions. Just as, on the one hand, it is contrary to reason that Jesus chose the cross for himself and committed suicide, it is equally unreasonable to suppose, on the other, that he is wasting precious years of his life by sitting idle on the heavens. He ought to have spent his time in working for the welfare of his people. Can anything more absurd be conceived of than that a man should first commit suicide for 'others' sake, and then being restored to life should go up to heaven and pass the rest of his days in idleness there ? A reasonable person cannot but condemn such stories as those of ascension and resurrection as pure falsehood. A true narrative is not only attested as such by evidence but it is also supported by reason. A false story, on the other hand, is devoid of both sorts of proof; it has not the necessary evidence and it is rejected by reason. But every evidence against their cherished theory is rejected by the Christians without any reason.

Take another circumstance. It is admitted by the Christians generally and stated in the Encyclopædia Britannica that the apostle Thomas came to India and became a martyr at Mylapore. It is further stated that a brother of Jesus also came with him. On the other hand, it is well-established that in those very days a prince-prophet came to India from Syria who was also of Israelite origin and that he subsequently died and was buried in Srinagar, Kashmir. How can it be denied then that the Israelite fugitive who went under the name of prince-prophet, and who stated that a book called the Gospel had been given to him by God, was in fact no other than Jesus Christ. All these facts and the conclusions that follow from them are plain enough, but, alas, the Christian

Missionaries love darkness and hate light. All the signs have been fulfilled and the time has come, but their supposed Messiah has not come down from heaven as yet. The sixth thousand from Adam which according to the Word of God was represented by the sixth day, and in which it was necessary that the Promised Messiah should have come, has come to an end, but Jesus has not yet made his appearance. A thousand years have passed since the devil was let loose, but Jesus who according to the prophetic word had to throw the Devil into an eternal dungeon is still absent. The plague which was foretold in the Gospel as a sign of the coming Messiah is making a horrible devastation in the country but still no sign of the coming Messiah. The star which was to denote the advent of the Promised Messiah made its appearance long ago but their Messiah is yet nowhere to be found.

Ye Christians of Europe and America! and ye seekers after truth! know it for certain that the Messiah who was to come has come, and it is he who is speaking to you at this moment. Heaven and earth have shown signs, and the prophecies of the holy prophets of God have seen their fulfilment. Almighty God has shown through me thousands of signs and furnished arguments of my truth in every way. I say to you truly that if the heavenly signs which have been shown on my hands, had been shown by Jesus, son of Mary, the Jews would have been saved from destruction except such as were the sons of perdition. Who is not aware of the effect of Jesus' signs on the minds of the Jews? Only one instance is sufficient to illustrate it, *viz.*, the case of Judas Iscariot, the favorite apostle for whom a throne had been promised in heaven, but who apostatized even in the presence of the master. Not only did he by his apostacy deprive himself of the promised throne but he also threw Jesus into innumerable difficulties. All ye that are desirous of perpetual happiness and eternal salvation, fly to me, for here is the fountain which will purge you of all your impurities, and here you will find the salvation which is the fruit of certainty and a strong faith and perfect knowledge. Know it for certain that your trust in the blood of Jesus is a vain trust. Had he been crucified not once but a thousand times, even then he could not have saved you. Salvation is in faith and love and

certainty and not in the blood of a man. Time is giving you the warning that the theory of a blood-bath is a false theory, therefore repent of such beliefs while there is time and before you are called to stand before the throne of God. Almighty God has sent me in this age that I might bear witness that all faiths have become corrupt and been tainted with falsehood with the only exception of Islam. If the truth of my testimony is not sealed by Divine authority, I am not true, but if the witness that I bear is confirmed by the Divine seal being impressed upon it, remember lest you bring yourselves under the judgment of God by rejecting truth. A weak mortal, the son of Mary, is by no means your God. *To me is given the spirit, against which no one can stand.* If you know that there is none among you who with the assistance of the spirit, can withstand the holy spirit that has been given to me, be sure that your silence would bring you under the judgment of God. And peace be unto those who follow the truth.

MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD,
Qadian, India.

Will Dowie Fight this Duel?

This question has been asked in many American newspapers. We have not space enough to quote them all but as a specimen of the view which the American Press has taken of the challenge given last September by the Promised Messiah to the pretender of Zion city, we reproduce the remarks of three well-known American newspapers. The Literary Digest of New York city says in its issue of 20th June 1903 :—

RIVAL MESSIAHS IN A PROPOSED PRAYER DUEL.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, of Qadian, Punjab, India, is "the Promised Messiah" according to statements made over his own signature. He has challenged Dr. Dowie, of this country, to a duel, the weapon being prayer and each side to petition the Almighty "that of us two whoever is the liar may perish first." The person who issues this challenge, according to *The Review of Religions* (Gurdaspur, India), is "the Promised Messiah" sent "for the reformation of the world exactly at the time fixed by calculations based on biblical prophecies as the time of the advent of the Messiah," and he has a following of over a hundred thousand members, "rapidly growing." The teaching of this Messiah

is that Christ was a mere mortal, a good man, without divinity. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad further declares in the organ already named:—

"Dr. Dowie should further bear in mind that this challenge does not proceed from an ordinary Muhammadan. I am the very Messiah, the promised one, for whom he is so anxiously waiting. Between Dr. Dowie's position and mine the difference is this, that Dowie fixes the appearance of the Messiah within the next twenty-five years, while I give him the glad tidings that the Messiah has already appeared. I am the Messiah, and Almighty God has shown numerous signs from earth as well as from heaven in my support. My following, which already claims a hundred thousand souls, is making a rapid progress. The proof that Dr. Dowie furnishes in support of his extravagant claims is the very height of absurdity. He claims to have healed hundreds of sick men. But why did his healing power fail in the case of his own beloved daughter, where it should have been exercised in the highest degree?"

John Alexander Dowie, writes the Messiah, "claims to have been sent by the son of Mary in his capacity of Godhead, that as his apostle he may draw the whole world to a belief in the despicable dogma of his divinity." The Indian claimant proceeds:—

"Whether the God of Muhammadans or the God of Dowie is the true God may be settled without the loss of millions of lives which Dr. Dowie's prediction would involve. That method is that, without threatening the Muhammadan public in general with destruction, he should choose me as his opponent and pray to God that of us two who ever is the liar may perish first. I look upon the son of Mary as a weak human being, although I recognize him as a prophet of God, while Dr. Dowie takes him for the Lord of Universe. Which of us is right, is the real point at issue. If Dr. Dowie is certain of the divinity of the son of Mary, he should publish the proposed prayer with the signatures of at least one thousand men affixed to it. Upon receiving it, I should address the same prayer to Almighty God and publish it with the signatures of the same number of witnesses. If Dr. Dowie has the courage to accept this challenge, he well thereby open a way for all other Christians to the acceptance of truth. In making this proposal, I have not taken the initiative, but the jealous God has inspired me upon Dr. Dowie's presumptuous prediction that all Muhammadans shall perish."

"An important discovery regarding Jesus Christ" has been made by the followers of the challenging Messiah, as we read in the Indian publication already named. This discovery is that "Jesus did not die upon the cross," but was "taken down alive and senseless." Subsequently the son of Mary "recovered, travelled eastward, and lived up to a good old age." His tomb, it is also stated, is "situated in the Khan Yar Street at Srinagar, Kashmere." Our authority opines: "The incontrovertible testimony afforded by the tomb itself, backed as it is by the unanimous oral testimony of hundreds of thousands of

men, and by the written evidence of ancient documents, becomes in our opinion too strong to be resisted by the most determined of skeptics."

A Chicago paper writes:—

ELIJAH DOWIE CHALLENGED TO DEATH DUEL OF PRAYER.*

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, a Muhammadan, who claims to be the Promised Messiah, wants to demonstrate who is the liar.

Elijah Dowie has been challenged to a praying duel to the death. The challenger is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, Punjab, India.

'Come thou, O self-styled prophet, to a duel,' says Mirza in his 'defi.' 'The weapons shall be prayer. Let us kneel on our knees in the dust of the earth, you and I together, and petition the Almighty that of us two whoever is the liar shall perish first.'

Elijah has not accepted the challenge, but neither has he declined it. Perhaps, in the calm of Ben Mac Dhui, among the Michigan peaches, he is formulating a reply. It may be that he thinks as the challenged party, he ought to have the choice of weapons, and will demand that vituperations be employed, the one who can call the other the most bad names to be the winner. Perhaps he will treat the challenge with scorn, and tell Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to go and get a reputation.

However that may be Elijah cannot afford to ignore the challenge. Mirza is no feather weight when it comes to pretensions. The *Review of Religions* published in Gurdaspur, India, through which the challenge is issued, says, "Mirza is 'the Promised Messiah' sent for the reformation of the world exactly at the time fixed by calculations, based on Biblical prophecies as the time of the advent of the Messiah," and he has a following of over a hundred thousand members, 'rapidly growing.' The teaching of this Messiah is that Christ was a mere mortal, a good man, without divinity. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad further declares, according to the Literary digest: (Here follow the quotations which are given in the Literary digest). At the close the paper says: "Will Elijah accept? What are the odds he will not?"

*The photographs of the Promised Messiah and Dr. Dowie are printed side by side with the following words below them respectively: "Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the 'East Indian Messiah,' who has challenged 'Elijah' Dowie to a duel by prayer,' and, "John Alexander Dowie, Chicago's "Reincarnated Elijah" who so far has not answered Muhammadan's challenge."

The Burlington Free Press writes in its issue of June 27th, 1903:—

A PRAYING DUEL PROPOSITION.

People in different parts of the country have been seriously discussing the efficacy of prayer in connection with the breaking of the recent drought, and there have been two sides to the question;..... A proposition to make a test in connection with prayer has just been put forth, however, in which there is little chance for controversy over the final result. Elijah Dowie, the religious pretender of Chicago, has just been challenged by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, Punjab, India, to engage in a supplication duel to death.....According to the code of honor, prophet Dowie, as the challenged party, should unquestionably have the choice of weapons, but the Promised Messiah has shrewdly proposed a test which the Chicago pretender cannot well afford to decline. To refuse to accept prayer as a test would be to acknowledge that he was unwilling to rest his case with the most powerful agency at his command, if his pretensions be true. On the other hand, it must be admitted that Dowie has no mean antagonist .....Dowie has not yet indicated his decision, but if he declines to accept this novel challenge, the public may look for a rapid decline in Dowie stock.

Although a year has passed away since the challenge was sent to Dr. Dowie, yet he has not spoken a single word, neither giving his assent to nor declining the proposal. On the other hand, he sets a very low value upon his pretended claim of being Elijah or an apostle of Jesus Christ, sent by him to restore all things before his second advent. In a letter, dated June 23rd, 1903, addressed to Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, Financial Secretary of the Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam, Dowie says expressly: "I desire to state that the question as to my having come in the spirit and power of Elijah is not necessary to fellowship.....I am broad enough to receive into fellowship those who do not see with me on this point; but on the other hand, I demand that those who do not agree with me, shall be broad enough not to harass other brethren.....You are not called upon to believe in my prophetic office." If really Dr. Dowie did not wish to be believed in as a special Messenger of Jesus Christ having authority from him to pronounce prophecies of destruction against the Muhammadans, why did he make all this noise? He has put forth a claim but he has no conviction of his own truth, for if he had such conviction, he would not have shown such moral

weakness. The strong conviction of truth which a true claimant has, gives him power to encounter and overcome every difficulty, but the man who is ready to give up his claim from motives of worldly gain or advantage, cannot have any conviction of the truth of his own claims. Instead of giving any proof of the truth of his claim, Dr. Dowie is managing to get rid of it, and the next step that he will take will probably be his resignation of the Elijahship or the office of restoration. So long as he saw that no reply came to him, he went on pouring denunciation after denunciation and threatening with destruction the whole Muhammadan world as well as the Christians who did not consider him Elijah, but now that a test of the truth of his claim has been pointed out to him, he reveals to us that it is not at all necessary for any one to believe in him as Elijah or a special Messenger of Jesus Christ. The ten thousand men or so which Dr. Dowie boasts to have gathered under his banner, are not, therefore, men who may in the true sense of the word be called his followers, but ordinary Christians who instead of paying the tithe to other clergymen pay it to Dr. Dowie. There may not be a single individual among these ten thousand admitting the truth of his claim. Dr. Dowie seems to be conscious of his falsehood, and, therefore, he neither accepts the proposal of the Promised Messiah nor has he the courage to reject it. This very man some time ago thundered forth fulminations regarding the destruction of Muhammadans in his life-time, but now that a definite object is offered to him at whom he may level his prayers of destruction, he assumes the advisable policy of silence.

In some American papers we read that Dr. Dowie's disciples say that he "has no time for a Punjabian." The question however is not whether the claimant of Messiahship is a Punjabian or a Nazarene, but whether he is the true claimant or the false. Dr. Dowie expects a Messiah, and one who claimed to be the Messiah long before Dr. Dowie got any reputation, tells him that he is the Promised one and points out to him a way in which he can judge of the truth of his claims. Dowie cannot fix his newly-built Zion as the place of the Messiah's descent and, therefore, it is his duty to find out the Messiah wherever he appears and to submit to him. Moreover the way pointed out by the Promised Messiah does not require much

time. He is not required to build a city or erect a lace-manufactury but simply to pray to the Divine Being and publish this fact. If Dr. Dowie refuses to take up the gauntlet thrown by the Promised Messiah, this will only show that he has no faith in prayer. The weapon to be used in the combat is prayer and the whole affair is to be submitted to God, who is to be invoked to settle the matter once for all by causing the liar to die first. Now if Dowie believes in the efficacy of prayer, and is sure that God will listen to his supplication, what hinders him from appearing in the arena. God is to be the umpire, and if Dowie is in the right, God will certainly accept his prayer and give His decision in his favor. Again, seeing that Dowie claims the power of healing the sick by means of prayer, he must be able to perform the much easier task of keeping up the health which he already possesses. When he can save those who stand on the brink of death and are about to be hurled into eternity, why should he not be able to ward off death from his own person which is in a sound state of health?

One or two American papers have thought and perhaps Dr. Dowie may also be labouring under the misconception that the condition that the prayer should be for the liar dying first is advantageous to the Promised Messiah. In the challenge to Dr. Dowie, it was plainly stated that the odds in this respect lay on the side of Dr. Dowie. The Promised Messiah is, at present, more than 67 years of age, while Dr. Dowie is about 56. In respect of age, therefore, Dr. Dowie has a clear advantage. In other respects too, the odds were on Dr. Dowie's side. The Promised Messiah has reached the age of about seventy years, and this is the limit of the average human age, there being very few persons overstepping this age in comparison with those who die under it. Dr. Dowie has, therefore, a manifest advantage, regard being had to the physical course of nature. If the sanitary conditions of a village situated in the Punjab and of a newly-built city in America are compared, still it is Dr. Dowie who can claim the advantage. Nay the devastations of the plague which is making havoc in India and especially in the Punjab render unsafe the life of every individual here, more particularly in villages where its ravages are most destructive. It is in villages that the most horrible devastations of the plague are to be witnessed. Not

a few of these have been depopulated and laid wholly waste, while numerous-village families have been wholly swept off. In one of these villages, thousands of which are laid waste by the plague every year, stands up an old man who under the ordinary circumstances of life, would be said to have reached the usual limit of mortal age, and challenges a man eleven years younger than himself, living under far more secure circumstances and healthier sanitary conditions to pray to God that the liar may die first. Can any sensible man take it for a joke? In the combat if it ever takes place, Dr. Dowie will have every advantage and the Promised Messiah every disadvantage that can possibly be conceived of. Even if Dr. Dowie does not accept the challenge, the mere act of giving such a challenge under such circumstances is a clear proof of the challenger's being from the God who has the power to interrupt the physical course of nature for his sake.

But this is not all. Dr. Dowie is not the only false claimant whom he has thus challenged. Here is another definite prophecy (not a challenge in this case) of the same nature which we take from the *Sunday Circle*, London, February 14th, 1903—

THE LATEST MESSIAH.

"An Indian rival to the Reverend J. H. S. Pigott of Clapton.

"The startling sensation made by the claims of the Rev. J. H. Smythe Pigott, Pastor of the Ark of the Covenant, Clapton, to be Jesus Christ the Messiah is, no doubt, still fresh in the minds of our readers. They will be interested to hear that a rival to the Clapton Pastor has arisen in the Far East in the Punjab province of India.

"The name of the most recent Messiah is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and he lives at Qadian, of which he is styled the Chief.

"He has just issued for circulation in Europe and America a document which he calls 'A warning to a Pretender to Divinity,' namely, to Mr. Pigott. It appears that Mr. Pigott's Private Secretary has sent Mirza Ghulam Ahmad two of the hand-bills, containing a statement of the Clapton Pastor's pretensions. The Indian Messiah applies to Mr. Pigott's conduct the epithets of insolent, blasphemous, arrogant, presumptuous, extravagant, insulting and so forth. Then follows the terrible warning of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. 'The

jealousy of God,' he says, 'has come into motion on account of the insult offered to His sacred name and to His Messengers by the haughty assertion of a man who calls himself God and the Lord of earth and heaven, and my true, pure, perfect and powerful God has, therefore, commanded me to warn him of the punishment that awaits him. If he does not repent of this irreverent claim, he shall be soon annihilated, even in my life-time, with sore torment proceeding from God, and not from the hands of a man. This warning of punishment is from the God who is the God of earth and heavens. His jealousy shall consume the pretender, so that none may again defile the earth with such false and arrogant claims.'

"Although the Indian Prophet claims to be the true Messiah, and to have come 'in the spirit and character of Jesus Christ,' yet he admits that he is a man. He asserts that he has worked thousands of heavenly signs, and that a pure transformation has been wrought in the lives of more than a hundred thousand followers by his agency. He concludes his extraordinary manifests with these words: 'The death of Mr. Pigott within my life-time shall be another sign of my truth. If I die before Mr. Pigott, I am not the true Messiah, nor am I from God. But if Almighty God makes me a witness of Mr. Pigot's death, which shall be brought about by the efficacy of my prayer, let the whole world bear witness that I am the true Messiah, and that I come from God. We are both under the control of a higher power, and that powerful God shall bring the false Messiah to destruction within the life-time of the true one. I am over sixty-five years of age, and Mr. Pigott is, I believe, at least fifteen years younger than myself.'

"It will be seen that Mirza's prophecy is very definite. He claims that in the past his warnings and prophecies have been clearly fulfilled."

It will appear from this that the same claimant who challenges one pretender to pray that the liar may die in the life-time of the true claimant, has predicted the death of another pretender, fifteen years younger than himself, within his own life-time. Is such a prophecy within the power of man? Had Dowie or Pigott the least certainty of their truth, they could not have remained silent. Several enemies of the Promised Messiah in the Punjab and India made similar supplications to the Almighty Being, *viz.*, that the liar may die in the life-time of the true claimant and all are now dead. Dr. Dowie should give proof of the strength of his faith in Jesus Christ for whom he is so anxiously waiting. As the restorer of things before the advent of Jesus, he ought to be present when the Messiah makes

his appearance, for if he dies before Jesus comes, his preparation would all be of no effect. According to his own calculations, Jesus may yet take another 25 years or a year or two less, and "Elijah" must live up to that time. Why does he then fear to stand up against the man who in a plague-stricken country has already reached the old age of seventy years. If Christ comes sooner or if the Promised Messiah lives up to that old age, still the advent of Jesus from heaven will falsify the claims of the Promised Messiah, and to falsify his prophecy, "Elijah" who probably will act as the grand vizier at that time, may ask Jesus Christ to put the Promised Messiah immediately to death. One American paper has expressed the desire that death should follow instantaneously upon the prayer. But we ask him if Jerusalem and the Jews were destroyed immediately. Is not the contest of prayer in its proposed form a sign from God? Is it within the power of a man to say that such and such a man will die within his life-time?

Monro on Sinlessness--Contd.

To

THE EDITOR,

Review of Religions.

SIR,

I am in receipt of the July number of the '*Review of Religions*' and note that of the 40 pages of which it consists, 30 are devoted to criticisms on a pamphlet of mine.

Permit me to point out that this pamphlet is not a new production, as might perhaps be gathered from the introductory remarks in the Review. It is merely a reprint (with a few explanatory comments added) of correspondence which appeared in the *Epiphany* for several months prior to January 1903, and of the contents of which Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was fully cognizant.

With the statements made by way of criticism on some of that correspondence in the current number of the *Review of Religions*, I am quite prepared to deal, if Mirza Ghulam Ahmad will open the way for me to do so. The correspondence in the *Epiphany* came to an end, as the Mirza must be perfectly well aware, because he failed to produce any Quranic passages in support of his theory as to the

word *zanb* being used in the Quran to signify a weakness of human nature not amounting to sin.

The same default as to producing a single Quranic passage in support of the Mirza's theory was visible in the 20 pages of an article in the June number of the *Review of Religions*. The same default is again conspicuous in the July issue.

When the legitimate demand for the production of such Quranic passages is complied with, the Mirza will be entitled to say that he has, at length and after great delay, dealt with the main issue involved in the correspondence. *Until this is done, no amount of writing on other points will conceal the fact that the main issue is ignored or evaded by the Mirza.* He cannot under such circumstances expect me to deal with subsidiary questions, or to ask the editor of the *Epiphany* to allow the discussion to be re-opened. The main issue, as I have already pointed out, is a simple one, *viz.*, *in the Quran the word zanb appears in 37 passages as stated by Mr. Upson—on which of those passages does the Mirza rely as supporting his theory?* By hitherto producing no such passages, although repeatedly called on to do so, the Mirza finds himself out of court, and he can only expect a re-hearing, when he purges himself from the default which led to judgment being given against him.

Yours faithfully,
JAMES MONRO.

Mr. Monro thinks that we are estopped from writing on the subject of sinlessness, until he, as a judge, is satisfied that we are quite right in interpreting *zanb* as a human weakness. But he is mistaken. Whatever excuses he may have that the pamphlet which he has issued is not a new production, still it is presented to the public in a new form, and notwithstanding Mr. Monro's remonstrance, we have every right to review it. The Rev. gentleman does not seem to have taken the trouble of going through the thirty pages of the Review of July to which he refers—though he is "quite prepared to deal" with the statements made in them even without reading them once. This, of course, according to Mr. Monro is fair and honest controversy. Had he read the Review, he would have been spared the trouble of sending the above communication. We had stated plainly that we would

discuss the meaning of *zanb* and Mr. Monro is requested to refer to page 251 of the Review where he will find the following words at the top: "We shall first discuss the nature of the deeds which are enumerated as the sins of the prophets by Mr. Monro, and will then consider other sides of the question including the meaning of the word *zanb*."

Mr. Monro is very fond of employing tactics or tricks in controversy to keep the public in deception. When replying to Mufti Muhammad Sadiq's letter appearing in the *Epiphany* of 23rd August, in which that gentleman gave three reasons (quoting of course from the *Review of Religions*) why the word *zanb* signified imperfection or weakness of human nature in the verses of the Holy Quran in which it was used with regard to the prophets, Mr. Monro gave his reason for not regarding this to be the meaning of the word *zanb* that the Quran related certain acts of the prophets which were sinful. But now that we have shown that the alleged sins of the prophets are no sins, Mr. Monro tells us that this is irrelevant and that he cannot pay any attention to the subject. Why did he make such a demand in his letter to the *Epiphany* then? Either Mr. Monro is intentionally deceiving the public or his memory must be exceptionally bad. Writing to the *Epiphany* of September 13th, 1902, this Rev. gentleman says*: "In the Holy Quran we have it recorded how Adam disobeyed God's command and ate of the forbidden fruit. In the same *Sura* (*Araf*) it is also recorded how Adam committed the grievous offence of attributing companions to God..... How will the Mufti characterize such actions on the part of Adam as recorded in the Quran? Was each of these actions a sin, or merely an imperfection of human nature not amounting to sin? We are similarly told.....that Abraham on three occasions told falsehoods..... Were such actions .....sins or merely imperfections of human nature not amounting to sin? Of Moses we have it recorded in *Sura Alkasas* that he committed an act of homicide..... Was this homicidal act on the part of Moses, in the opinion of the Mufti, a sin or merely an imperfection of human nature not amounting to sin? Again in *Sura Araf*, we have detailed the action of Aaron in aiding and abetting the idolatory of

* This letter Mr. Monro has reproduced in his pamplet on pages 10—12.

the Israelites with reference to the golden calf..... In the opinion of Mufti Muhammad Sadiq, was this action of Aaron.....a sin or merely an imperfection of human nature? I might extend the list of actions on the part of prophets, *e. g.*, of Noah, David, Jonas, &c., but the above instances will suffice." So persistent was Monro in *demanding an explanation of the acts of the prophets to settle the meaning of zanb*, but now that an explanation is given, conceive him intimating to us in a special communication that he does not want this! Question after question was asked by him how such and such act of such and such a prophet was to be characterized, and when the answer is given, with what boldness he declares that we are evading the point at issue.

Mr. Monro is in fact ready to undertake every course, however remote it may be from truth and honesty, to uphold his opinion. Such a man can never be satisfied that the prophets of God are sinless unless he is undeceived of the great delusion to which he is subject that Jesus Christ went up to heaven, and unless he finds his supposed Deity lying under dust—in the sacred dust of Srinagar, of course. Does Mr. Monro admit that *istighfar* is a prayer addressed to God for seeking His protection to be save from sins and not necessarily a prayer for seeking pardon of sins already committed? Convincing proof of this has been given and it has been shown that even those who shall have entered paradise shall constantly resort to *istighfar* according to the Quran. We hope Mr. Monro will let us know if he is satisfied as to the meaning of *istighfar*.

Mr. Monro ought to remember that the Promised Messiah never entered into any controversy with him. His presumption that he "was fully cognizant" of the contents of the *Epiphany* or that he "must be perfectly well aware" that any controversy in which Mr. Monro took part had come to a close, is altogether false. The Promised Messiah contributed an article to the *Review of Religions* in May 1902 on the sinlessness of the prophets, and the Christian Missionaries have failed to reply to that article. Mr. Monro took up only one point relating to the signification of the word *zanb*, but in the Review this discussion occupied only two pages in an article extending over forty-five pages, and unless Mr. Monro either refutes the main portion of that article or declares his assent to it, the Messiah

need not answer to his futile objections. Mr. Monro must take the article as a whole and either refute all the arguments advanced in it on the sinlessness of the prophets or admit in plain words that he has no objection to any portion of that article except that relating to *zanb*. Is it honest on his part to misrepresent the writer of the article by presenting before the public a very small portion of the subject and concealing the rest?

Has Mr. Monro given any consideration to the whole of the evidence brought forward by the Promised Messiah? If not, is he entitled to say that he has refuted his arguments? It is moreover the cumulative force of the evidence which is to be taken into consideration and one portion of it is not to be cut asunder as if it had no connection with the rest. The article was written to establish the doctrine of sinlessness, and the statement as to the meaning of the word *zanb* formed only one argument out of many. The subject was divided into the following eleven sub-headings: 1, Salvation and Intercession; 2, Relation between Sinlessness and Intercession; 3, The Holy Quran upon the Prophet's Perfection; 4, *Istighfar*; 5, Difference between *zanb* and *jurm*; 6, Need for Intercession; 7, The Quran upon the Intercession of the Holy Prophet; 8, The Christian Deity; 9, Divine Source of the Words and Deeds of the Holy Prophet; 10, The Appearance of the Promised Messiah; 11, Final Solution of the question of Sinlessness. Of these Mr. Monro objected to the 5th sub-heading. But even in this case, he did not act honestly. The Promised Messiah pointed out the difference between *zanb* and *jurm* and such was the fifth sub-heading of his article. But Mr. Monro says that he cannot consider the meaning of *jurm* until the meaning of *zanb* is settled. The Holy Quran is not a dictionary of the Arabic language, and the true significance of a word as used in the Holy Quran can only be determined by reference to other words having a similar significance or by reference to the context or the tenor of the Holy Book. It was on these principles that in proving the main issue regarding the sinlessness and intercession of the prophets, the Promised Messiah drew attention to the marked difference observed by the Holy Quran between *zanb* and *jurm*. But Mr. Monro would be the last man to be straightforward in a controversy. He has his tricks in disputations and unscrupulously makes use of them. In the Septem-

ber issue of the *Review of Religions* in an editorial, we established the following four facts for the determination of the meaning of *zanb*, but Mr. Monro had neither the courage to reproduce that article in his pamphlet nor the power to refute it, and, therefore, he thought that the best policy was to ignore it altogether. The four facts are as follows* :—

(1.) The word *zanb* is used only about 40 times in the Holy Quran, while the words *jurm*, *ism* and *fisq* are used about two hundred times.

(2.) Notwithstanding the frequency of their use, the Holy Quran has not in a single instance used the words *jurm*, *ism* and *fisq* for the prophets of God.

(3.) The words *jurm*, *ism* and *fisq* have been expressly defined by the Holy Quran to be deeds in violation of the commandments of God deserving punishment and their committers are in plain terms threatened with hell.

(4.) The word *zanb* has nowhere been so defined in the Holy Quran, nor has its committer been threatened with hell.

Neither Mr. Monro nor any one of his friends has made the slightest attempt to refute any one of these four propositions. The foolish attempt of the learned Missionary of Shebin-el-Kom will simply be laughed at by every sensible person who has some acquaintance with the Arabic language. Mr. Monro gives himself too much importance when he thinks of having the Promised Messiah as his adversary in the field of controversy. But he has not yet as much experience as the Lord Bishop of Lahore, and he must yet learn a lesson from that dignitary. Perhaps Mr. Monro thinks that the Bishop did not know his tactics but to us it seems more probable that from his greater experience he knew that these will be of no avail where the two sides were to stand on a platform of equality, for as a matter of fact the Bishop has worked as a missionary for a long time. The tactics could only be of use in the *Epiphany* or in special pamphleteering.

Only a few words as to the judgment pronounced by Mr. Monro,

* See page 382 of the "Review of Religions" for 1902.

may be added here. He pronounces a judgment by default against the Promised Messiah, because he himself never refuted any argument of the Promised Messiah on the subject of sinlessness, or any argument of the *Review of Religions* on the meaning of *zanb*. But how has he himself met our arguments on the sinfulness of Jesus as represented in the Gospels? Why has he remained persistently deaf to every argument against the alleged sinlessness of Jesus? Has not his attention and that of his friends been repeatedly called to the fact that whereas other prophets are again and again called good, righteous, pious, &c., in the Word of God, Jesus refused to be called good? These words are also explained by his conduct in receiving the baptism of repentance at the hands of John. Has Mr. Monro pointed out any verse of the Bible in which "not good" means "good?" Or can he point out any rule of construction according to which "why callest thou me good?" means "Thou shouldst call me good"? Or does any dictionary of the English language state that "not good" and "good" are equivalent? Does he not know that these and similar other questions have been repeatedly asked during the last 20 months, and yet the Missionaries including himself have observed a conspiracy of silence on these points? Do they not say that they come to India as the evangelists and exponents of the Gospel of Jesus, and yet they do not answer a single question? Is not Mr. Monro ashamed of pronouncing judgment by default, for his question, according to his own statement, not being answered for five months, when he himself has not answered our questions for 20 months? Is this the truth which he has learned from the Gospel? Is this conduct worthy of an honest controvertialist? He has failed to answer the very pertinent questions regarding the alleged sinlessness of Jesus on the strength of the Gospels —questions which have been repeatedly put to him during the last 20 months, and to conceal his failure, he declares with an assumption of infallibility that he has pronounced a judgment for default against the Promised Messiah. Before assuming such a lofty bearing, he should answer the questions which have been put to him so often, or declare in plain words that he is unable to answer them. If he does not adopt either of these courses, we shall not have to do anything more with him, and we will have a right to ignore all his correspondence whether sent to us or published in the *Epiphany*.

Similarly the words " like unto thee" (*i.e.*, Moses) clearly show that the prophecy is applicable to the Holy Prophet of Arabia and not to Jesus. The prophet to whom the prophecy refers must be like unto Moses. Now the most prominent and characteristic features of the life of Moses in which the promised prophet must bear a similarity to him were as follows :—Firstly, he was a Lawgiver. Secondly, he triumphed over his enemies and Pharoah with all his host was destroyed. Thirdly, he delivered his followers from tyranny and persecution and made them heirs to temporal government. What we read of Jesus in the Gospels leads us to conclude that Jesus did not bear the least resemblance to Moses. He gave no law to his people. On the other hand, he abolished the law of Moses. Again, instead of triumphing over his enemies like Moses, the enemy triumphed over him. The Jews dragged him to the gallows and the 'king of the Jews' expired on the cross. Again he did not succeed in making his followers the rulers of the land. The Jews and even his followers expected that he would restore the throne of David, but all their hopes were vain. Thus we see that Jesus was not like unto Moses in any respect. The prophecy might have been appropriately applied to Jesus if it had read '*unlike* unto thee' instead of '*like* unto thee.' Moreover, Moses was a man born of mortal parents, but Jesus was a God and there can be no similarity between a God and a man. But if we turn to the Holy Prophet and compare his life with that of Moses, we find that there exists a very marked similarity between the two. Our Holy Prophet was a law-giver like Moses. He triumphed over his enemies like Moses. His foes were completely annihilated like those of Moses. He, like Moses, delivered his followers from the persecutions of the tyrants of the desert, and his followers became conquerors and rulers like the followers of Moses. So the words 'like unto thee' are clearly applicable to the Holy Prophet of Arabia.

Again the words 'I will put my words in his mouth and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him' are applicable to our Holy Prophet and not to Jesus. God in exact accordance with the words of the prophecy put His words into His Holy Prophet's mouth which he delivered in their entirety to the people and which are now to be found embodied in the Holy Quran. The Christians do not possess any book containing the words of God which He put

into the mouth of Jesus. The Gospels, indeed, contain a few fragmentary speeches of Jesus, but those speeches are the words of Jesus and not the words of God. Jesus never announced that the words which he uttered were not his words but the words of God which were revealed to him. In order to apply the prophecy to Jesus, Mr. Mohan Lal states that Jesus was the Word of God. I do not mean to discuss here whether he was actually the Word of God or not. Even if we suppose that Jesus was the Word of God, this only shows that the prophecy of Moses is not applicable to Jesus, for in the prophecy we read that the words of God shall be put in the prophet's mouth. This shows that the Word of God as used here is a thing quite distinct from the prophet. So if Jesus was the Word of God, he could not be the prophet. Mr. Mohan Lal's position would have been less unreasonable if he had maintained that Mary was the prophet (or rather the prophetess) spoken of in Deut., for Jesus, who was the Word of God, was put by God into the womb of Mary (though not in her mouth).

Moreover, Jesus never claimed that prophecy for himself. On the other hand, we are expressly told in the New Testament that the prophet spoken of in Deut. had yet to appear. For this, I beg to refer the reader to the following passage in the Acts:—'And He shall send Jesus which before was preached unto you, whom the heavens must receive until the time of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, 'A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me . . . . and it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.' (Acts III, 20-23). In these verses it is expressly stated that the second advent of Jesus shall not take place until the prophet spoken of in Deut. has appeared.

It now remains for us to see whether our Holy Prophet claimed to have fulfilled this prophecy in himself. On this point the Holy Quran is very plain. It says : انا ارسلنا اليكم رسولا شاهدا عليكم كما ارسلنا الى فرعون رسولا *i.e.*, We have sent unto you a prophet and a witness over you, *like the prophet* whom We sent unto Pharoah.' Again we have the verse : (الاحقاف) وشهد شاهد من بنى اسرائيل على مثله *i. e.*, a witness from among the Israelites (*i.e.*, Moses) has borne wit-

ness to the appearance of one like unto himself. Similarly we have the words: (النجم) ما ينطق عن الهوى ان هو الا وحى يوحى i.e., "He (the Holy Prophet) doth not speak of his own will; it is no other than a revelation which hath been revealed unto him." These words of the Holy Quran exactly correspond to the words 'I will put my words in his mouth and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.' Similarly the Holy Quran tells us that if the Holy Prophet had said things which God had not commanded him to speak, he would have died a speedy and painful death. All this clearly shows that the Holy Quran claims the prophecy of Moses to have been fulfilled in the Holy Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Having done with Deut. 18: 18-22, I now proceed to see whether the passage of the New Testament to which Mr. Mohan Lal refers contains any reference to a false prophet. The passage runs thus ..... 'He confessed, I am not the Christ, and they asked him, what then? Art thou Elijah; and he saith, I am not; Art thou that prophet; and he answered, no." The fact that the words 'that prophet' in the above passage refer to a well-known Promised Prophet and not to a false prophet is clear from the following considerations:—(1). The object of their question to John was to learn what he claimed to be. They could not ask him whether he claimed te be a false prophet. (2). They asked him. Why, then, baptizeth thou if thou art not the Christ, neither Elijah, nor that prophet.' This clearly shows that here by 'that prophet' they meant a true prophet who was authorized to baptize. (3). The references on the margin of the authorised version of the Bible show that the words 'that prophet' refer to the prophet spoken of in the 15th and 18th verses of Deut. which according to Mr. Mohan Lal himself contain a prophecy for a true prophet. (4). Whenever the word 'prophet' stands alone, it invariably means a true prophet, never a false one. (5). Mr. Mohan Lal's statement that when the Jews said to John 'Art thou that prophet,' they alluded to the false prophet spoken of in Deut. 18: 20 is unfounded. His assertion can carry no weight unless he proves that the learned Jews also saw a prophecy for a false prophet in the 20th verse just as he sees one in the said verse.

Yours faithfully,

SHER ALI,

Qadian.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL II.] OCTOBER, 1903. [No. 10.

بسم ا لله ا لرحمن ا لرحيم

نحمده و نصلى على رسوله ا لكريم

The Second Advent of the Messiah.

THE importance of this subject can hardly be over-estimated It rests on the sacred books of three great religions of the world. Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The Messianic belief took its birth withthe Jews. The Hebrew prophets were the first utterers of the prophecy and their sayings were recorded in the sacred books and traditions of Judaism. The prophecy was to them the brightest hope and in its fulfilment were centred all their hopes. As to true notions respecting the person of the Messiah, the Jewish sacred books and traditions as interpreted and understood by the Jews are our best authority. By the advent of the Messiah the Jews never understood, nor could they so long as they believed in the teachings of Moses and the prophets conceive the idea, that a God incarnate would make his appearance in their midst. The firm Jewish belief in One Immaterial and Infinite God was absolutely opposed to a belief in the Divinity of a man, and, therefore, neither their prophets could teach, nor the Israelites believe in, such a doctrine. The Messianic era meant to the Jews an era of peace and of the prosperity of the Jewish nation peculiarly characterized by the predominance of the doctrine of Divine Unity. In fact the great hope of Israel to which it had been led by the prophets, was that with the advent of the Messiah, the absolute Unity of the Divine Being, would become the universal dogma of all tribes. Their Messiah was to be a prophet of the type of the prophets that already appeared among them. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the Messiah who had been promised to the Jews was

not to be God, but a prophet of God. There are however even in Jewish tradition traces of prophecies speaking of the advent of two Messiahs, the first of whom is spoken of as the suffering Messiah and the other as the victorious one; the two descriptions meaning only that the first Messiah will not succeed in establishing the universality of Monotheism, but that this honor will belong to the second. We may add here that the Christians and the Muhammadans regard the prophecy of the appearance of the first Messiah to have been fulfilled in the advent of Jesus, while the Jews by rejecting Jesus as a false prophet are still expecting the appearance of the first Messiah. And yet amid all the troubles and persecutions suffered by the Jews, the belief in the advent of the Messiah was the bright hope which bore them up through all adversities and gave them courage and fortitude. The Jews have thus furnished a practical proof of their strong faith in the advent of the Messiah. The importance of this prophecy with the Christians, however, is even greater. Jesus himself taught and the apostles firmly believed in the second advent of the Messiah, and every Christian generation since that time has had a clear and certain faith in the prophecy, to which it has looked as its only hope. So great is the importance given to it in the Christian faith that it is considered by the Christians the "*greatest of prophecies*" and the 'best possible proof that *the Bible is from God.*" If the Messiah does not come, the Bible falls to the ground. With the Muhammadans, it is a solemn Divine promise regarding whose fulfilment not the least doubt can be entertained, that the Messiah will appear among them, and this promise is based on the Holy Quran and was explained by the Holy Prophet himself.

Three points arise in the solution of the question of the second advent, *viz.*, its time, manner and object. The element of time, if it is rightly calculated, should be our most important consideration. Moreover, believing in God as the All-wise and Beneficient Master, the conclusion is inevitable that the Reformer must come at a time when he is most needed. So the time of the advent is determined not only by calculations based on prophecies and the fulfilment of the signs foretold, but also by the need which is felt at the time. As a matter of fact, the three nations, Jews, Christians and Muhammadans, to whom the promise of the advent of the Messiah was given, agree in one thing, if they agree at all, *viz.*, that the time is come. This

remarkable agreement of opinion as to the advent of the new Messianic era, supported as it is by a general feeling prevailing throughout the whole world that it is just the hour of the appearance of the Promised Messiah and by the strong need which is felt at the present moment by all religions, proves to demonstration that in respect of time we cannot go a step further, and that if the Promised Messiah has not still appeared, the promises of his appearance are all in vain.

The Jews notwithstanding their utter indifference to religion which is the consequence of centuries of suffering, are showing signs of activity in religion which are unmistakably significant. There are national movements among the Jews in all parts of the world, whose object is to bring back the scattered people to their original home. Thousands have already settled at Jerusalem and hundreds of thousands are making preparations. They have a strong belief that the Messiah is coming very soon and hence they are sacrificing all their worldly interests, notwithstanding their proverbial love for money, for making preparations to receive the Messiah. Never were their hearts better prepared to receive the Messiah than at the present moment, and this is an unmistakable sign that he who is anxiously waited for has come.

Christianity is even more prepared to receive the Messiah at the present moment. From the time of the first Christian generation, when the words of Jesus (Matt. 24: 34) indicating that he will not die upon the cross, were mistaken for a promise of the second advent of the Messiah, to the present hour, such a fervent hope was never entertained that the Messiah is coming. Men's minds are everywhere uneasy and their hearts throb as if the Messiah were knocking at the doors. Ah! he is knocking no doubt, but who will open? There is a universal belief throughout Christendom that the hour of the Messiah's advent has come. The voice is heard from all places, near and remote. It is very remarkable that not only are we declared to be on the eve of the Messiah's coming, but the most accurate calculations based on Biblical prophecies have shown that the hour is already left behind. The fact is that all the signs for the coming of the Messiah have been fulfilled, but since most Christians are in error as to the manner of his coming, therefore they carry on their expectations further, vainly hoping that Jesus will come in the manner in which they wish it. Their calculations are right, and they do not

fail to see the fulfilment of the signs of the advent, but it is the manner and object of the advent that they fail to recognise.

Individual attempts to calculate the time of the advent of the Messiah were made as early as the commencement of the eighteenth century, but no general cry was raised at the time. The erroneousness of these views was pointed out by later calculations, and by a careful interpretation of the prophecies and the enumeration of the signs fixed for the coming of the Messiah, it was shown that the Messiah must come in 1868. These views found a general acceptance and the fixed hour was anxiously waited for, but it passed away without any change in the clouds. It was a great shock not only to the advocates of this opinion but also to the public generally, but the belief remained rooted with the same firmness as before, and the failure was ascribed to errors in calculating the actual date. The "Millennial Dawn" was published in 1889, and improving upon the earlier calculations, it showed that the sixth thousand after Adam at the end of which it was necessary that the Messiah should come ended in 1873. It further showed by calculations based on Biblical prophecies which we need not repeat here, that 1873 was the year of the coming of the Messiah, that from that time up to 1914 he would gather his saints and that then his kingdom would be firmly established so as to be seen by all men, but that until that time he was not to be recognised but by the chosen few. It also held that the mistake of the previous calculators did not lie so much in errors in calculations as in failing to recognise the manner and object of the Messiah's advent. Mr. Dimbleby brought out his famous book "The Appointed Time," of which a second edition was published soon afterwards in 1896. He was well-known as a member of the British Chronological and Astronomical Associations, and as the author of several works such as "All Past Time," and "Date Repeating Cycles of Eclipses." By the application of the principle of the measurement of time by Eclipses or Solar Cycles, he calculated the year 1898 to be the ultimate date of the appearance of the Messiah. In the preface to this book, the learned author wrote: "This book is written in order to place before Christian readers the best and latest methods by which evidence is obtained of the approaching fulfilment of the great prophecies, and in such a way that readers may see and judge for themselves.....Now that the study of prophecy has become a science, we are reaping a great harvest of new

facts, and accumulating a mass of overwhelming evidence which places the subject beyond all question..... When the prophecies are thus tabulated, they form a framework of completeness which cannot be altered without rejecting the words of scripture, and wrecking the universe. ..... I have, therefore, had to continue the same cardinal dates, all of which focus their light on the end of the Gentile times in 5896½ (our 1898¼), which every intelligent mind must now admit is the beginning of a new era." To people who were impatiently waiting the advent of the Promised Messiah, this book came as a blessing, for it helped them to keep on the hope which had brought disappointment so many times. But even this book was characterized by the same mistake, *viz.*, no heed was paid to the manner of advent and, therefore, it brought only a fresh disappointment. The year 1898 passed away but nothing happened which the Christians, involved as they were in fatal error as to the manner of advent, could look upon as bringing about a fulfilment of their cherished hopes. But the expectancy of Christianity became even more intense on this bitter disappointment, and Colonel Roberts brought out a book in which he showed by his calculations that the coming of the Messiah could not go further than the year 1899. And now we see almost a legion of booklets showing the fulfilment of the signs and stating that the hour of advent is very very near, and that the Anti-Christ is to be found in the present form of the Christian Church itself. "The Unveiling of the Daughters of an aged Mother" published in 1900, discovers the Anti-Christ in "the profession of the day." It makes "Popery in the Church of Rome" as "the Great Anti-Christ," and looks upon almost all denominations of Christianity as branches of the same, "daughters of the whore" as it likes to call some of them.

What do we learn from this? All these facts decidedly lead to the conclusion that the coming of the Messiah is now or never. In fact it appears clearly that the hour is left behind and that the date has been carried on farther and farther only on account of repeated disappointments, and that according to the best calculations the Messiah must have already come. Too much stress has been laid by the Christians on one side of the question to the utter neglect of the other sides. On every disappointment it was thought that there was some error in calculations, and, therefore, not the least attention was bestowed on the question of the manner of the Promised Messiah's advent.

Every interpreter of prophecies assuming a particular manner of advent, added a few years to the previously calculated date to avoid a total disappointment. But the hope being a real hope has not been obliterated from the hearts of men notwithstanding sad disappointments every now and then. A similar mistake caused the Jews to reject Jesus. At his birth they were anxiously waiting for a Messiah, but the idea never occurred to them that though coming at the appointed time, yet he might come in a manner different from that in which they thought that he would appear. They never lost the hope that a Messiah would come to them but they could not accept Jesus for he did not come in the manner in which they expected his appearance on the basis of their sacred books and traditions. The Christians ought to have profited by their example but they are repeating the same error. Every sign that was foretold has been witnessed, but they are looking for the Messiah in the wrong direction though at the right time. Earthquakes, plague, famine, wars and terrestrial as well as heavenly phenomena bear witness to the one fact that there is to be no more waiting for the Messiah's advent.

We will now consider the time of the advent of the Messiah as fixed by the Muslims. In this case we have several very important considerations which conclusively settle the question of time. In the first place, the Holy Quran describes the Holy Prophet as the like of Moses in the chapter entitled *Al-Muzammal*, thus claiming the fulfilment of the prophecy of Deut. 18: 15-18 in his person. In another chapter entitled the "Light," it promises that from among the followers of the Prophet, successors will be raised to him "like unto" the successors raised to Moses. These two resemblances, the likeness of the Founder of the Muslim Law to the Founder of the Israelite Law, and the likeness of the successors of the one to the successors of the other, clearly demonstrate that as a Messiah terminated the chain of the successors of Moses, a Messiah would also appear to terminate the chain of the successors of the Holy Prophet. The prediction of the advent of a Messiah in this manner clearly indicates several resemblances between the two Messiahs of which we are at present concerned only with the resemblance in time. The distance of time between Moses and Jesus is 14 centuries or according to the Jewish account 13 centuries. It was, therefore, necessary that a Messiah should have appeared in the fourteenth century after the Prophet and this brings to us

the present time. What is needed is only a resemblance, and the view that the present is the time for the coming of the Messiah is strongly corroborated by other considerations.

The Quran has wisely fixed certain signs for the advent of the Messiah so that all men might know from their fulfilment that the time is come. Of these the most important sign is the predominance of the Christian religion and the activity of the Christian nations in every department of life. Of this predominance and activity there is not the least doubt. The Christian Missionaries have crept into the corners of the earth. There are at present upwards of 77,000 men engaged in missionary work and the enormous sum of Rs. 50,000,000 is annually spent on them. There are 250 missionary societies, with agents working at more than 20,000 stations. Men and women are both engaged in the task. If the Messiah is not needed now, will he be needed when the whole world is led to believe in the false doctrine of which the Holy Quran had said: "The heavens might almost be rent there at, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fal down in pieces ?"

Another great sign of the advent of the Messiah to which a reference is contained in the Quran, and of which the particulars are detailed in a tradition, is that relating to the eclipses of the moon and the sun occurring respectively on the 13th and 28th of the month of *Ramzan*. This came to pass in 1894 and it is a visible sign of the advent of the Messiah, foretold thirteen hundred years before its occurrence and manifested in such a way that every individual could see it for himself. Among other signs related in the Holy Quran and authentic traditions are the appearance of the plague, which is at present devastating India and several other countries, the introduction of a new mode of conveyance in place of camels, &c., which has been fulfilled by the construction of railways throughout the world, the increase of knowledge, the mixing together of people living in distant lands, the multiplicity of canals, the spreading of papers and a host of other signs which we cannot detail here. Our object is simply to show that the signs are all fulfilled and that they denote not that the advent of the Messiah is yet expected but that it has already taken place. These signs show that the Messiah has appeared and it is the duty of every seeker after truth to find him out. Another point which

deserves to be noticed is that the revelations of all the Muhammadan saints fix the appearance of the Messiah at the commencement of the 14th century of Hejira, and not a single revelation takes it further. There is moreover an authentic tradition to the effect that a spiritual Revivalist will be raised among the Muslims at the commencement of every century, and since the Messiah will also be a spiritual revivalist, therefore if he does not appear in the earlier part of the century, his advent shall have to be delayed for another century, an idea not only repugnant as suggesting the decline of Islam for another century, but also opposed to all prophetical writings.

We have thus seen that the present is a time which the Jews, the Christians and the Muhammadans declare with one voice to be the time of the advent of the Promised Messiah. The concurrence on this points of three great religions, otherwise differing in their conceptions of the Messiah, is a very significant fact. The first Messiah was expected by one nation only and that a very small one, but the second Messiah is expected by three great nations and they all agree that the time of his advent is come. It is a time when all religious and national prejudices should be thrown away lest they might prove a hinderance in the acceptance of the truth. The Messiah is come and it is, therefore, the duty of every seeker after truth to walk after him. No stronger proof is needed to establish that the Messiah has come than the agreement of three different religions, each coming to the same conclusion by a different channel of arguments and on the authority of different sacred books. The signs foretold by the Israelite prophets, such as Daniel and others, as well as those described by Jesus and his apostles and those predicted by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, are strangely enough all appearing at the same time. If ever a prophecy was fulfilled exactly, we are indeed witnessing the plainest fulfilment of such a prophecy to-day.

The next thing we have to consider is the manner and object of the advent of the Messiah. The statement will no doubt startle many but truth is alway startling when it has long been forgotten. It may be said that the manner of his advent is plainly given and there is no need of discussing this point. But the fact is that this is the very point on which people have stumbled before, and, therefore, it is on this ground that our steps should be carefully guided and cautiously taken.

There is a settled conviction in the minds of millions that all the signs have been fulfilled and that it is the time of the Messiah's advent. The world seems to have entered on quite a new era and every heart feels that some change has taken place. It is, therefore, the more necessary that the question of the manner of the Messiah's advent should be carefully considered.

It is particularly gratifying to learn in this respect that we are not left to guesses in the determination of this momentous issue. We have a clear and straight road before us chalked out by the Word of God and His Laws. We are already acquainted with the prophecies of the advent of the first Messiah—or, of the first advent of the Messiah: put it as you will—and with their fulfilment, and they will be the safest guide to us in the solution of the question before us. The prophecies on which the Jews based their Messianic hopes were to be found in their sacred books believed by them, as also by the Christians, to be the Word of God. The most important sign by which the true Messiah was to be distinguished from the false claimants, was the descent of Elijah the prophet from heaven before him. The Jews believed on the authority of their sacred books that Elijah had been taken up to heaven alive and that he would descend from that celestial resting place before the advent of the Messiah. They had, therefore, not the least fear that they would not be able to recognise the Messiah at his advent. There was a sure sign in their hands by which he was to be recognised and there was not the least possibility of their missing the welcome opportunity. Such a supernatural event as the descent of one of the most revered prophets from heaven could not pass unnoticed. It was by means of such a striking miracle that the advent of the Messiah, who was to be their great deliverer, was to be announced to them. Such was the prophecy but mark its fulfilment. A child was born in the house of Zacharias and was named John. He was a righteous man and began to preach after the fashion of the Hebrew prophets. Jesus received baptism at his hands confessing his sins and declared himself as the Messiah. The objection was naturally raised that he could not be the true Messiah as his advent was not heralded by the miraculous appearance of Elijah. In answer to this, Jesus pointed to John and told the Jews that "this is Elias which was for to come." But how could the Jews believe it? Any impostor, they argued, could say this. Almighty God had pro-

mised to them that the prophet Elijah himself would be sent back and this much they were sure that John could not be Elijah as they knew him to have been born in the house of Zacharias, while Elijah was to come down from heaven. It was, no doubt, the right time for the coming of the Messiah, but Jesus, they thought, could not be the Promised one as he did not appear in the manner described in their books. The prophecy clearly indicated that Elijah himself would come. It did not say that the like of Elijah would come. Even if they had believed Jesus, they could have supposed John to be the like of Elijah but not Elijah himself. Yet the like of Elijah had never been promised to them. How could they change the Word of God and read for "Elijah," "the like of Elijah." The very first condition which could have pointed out the advent of the Messiah was totally wanting.

The Jews had other difficulties in recognising Jesus as the true Messiah. Whenever the deliverance of Israel was brought about it was by means of striking miracles, so that the chosen people might at once recognise their deliverer. They had seen extraordinary manifestations of Divine power; they had heard His voice amidst wind and storm; they had seen Him manifesting Himself to Moses amidst thunder and convulsions of nature at the Sinai; and they had been told to expect similar wonderful signs at the advent of the Messiah. Apart from such prophecies, the idea was deeply rooted in their hearts that such a great deliverer as the long-expected Messiah ought to have his advent declared by some such startling revelation. But how were their expectations fulfilled? They witnessed nothing extraordinary until they heard the words from the lips of Jesus that he was the Messiah. The effect of the former miracles which they had witnessed at the adven of Moses and other great prophets was so great upon them that they could not for a moment conceive the idea that the Messiah could appear among them all of a sudden without any previous extraordinary revelation, notwithstanding plain prophetical statements promising such wonders.

That was not all. The prophecies clearly told them that the Messiah was to be of royal descent, a descendant of David that is to say, and he was to re-establish the kingdom of his great ancestor in Israel. He was to deliver the Israelites from the foreign yoke and bring about their independence by freeing them from the bondage

of tyrants. As for his birth, those who could remember it, were highly suspicious of its legitimacy. At the most they could take him for a son of Joseph, the carpenter, and the royal descent was far from being established. Within a short time after he set up his claim to Messiahship, they further saw that it was vain to expect that he would restore the throne of the prophet-king and deliver them from the Roman yoke. All their hopes in relation to Jesus at once failed for no prophecy that declared the manner and object of his advent was fulfilled in his person. According to their calculations, the time hod no doubt come, but they could not believe in a person in whom none of the prophecies was fulfilled. They were ready to hail the advent of the Messiah, but not without the realization of the promises which formed the central hope of the prophecy.

Again a large number of prophecies unanimously stated that the time of the Messiah was to be an era of universal peace, harmony and brotherhood and Jerusalem was to be the centre of the world. Could Jesus be recognised as the Messiah by this sign? Nothing that had been predicted, had appeared. It was impossible that a true Messiah could appear without the manifestation of a single one of the numerous signs that had been foretold. The words of the sacred books which had been revealed to the prophets were before their eyes. How could they accept a Messiah by rejecting the very books which invited them to such a belief. They sighed amid all their misfortunes for the Messianic time of which such beautiful pictures had been drawn to them; they looked for the Messiah who was to sit on the throne of David and deliver them from foreign yoke; they longed for the day when Jerusalem was to be the centre around which all nations had to gather; and they prayed for the moment when Israel instead of being trampled under the feet of others was to rule all nations of the world. But in Jesus and his advent, they could not see the manifestation of a single sign.

The question here naturally arises that the prophecies being so clear whose fulfilment was not witnessed in Jesus, were the Jews in the right in rejecting the Messiah as an impostor? From Christians and Muhammadans we cannot expect an answer in the affirmative. Yet what is to be done with the prophecies? They are found in books accepted by Jews and Christians as forming part of the Word of God.

Their words are plain. If the Jews had not required their fulfilment, they would have been guilty of rejecting the Word of God. Moreover they would not have in that case been able to distinguish between true and false claimants. The pseudo-Messiahs who before and at the time of Jesus had appeared in abundance among the Jews had rendered them distrustful of such claimants. From these considerations it would appear that it was the duty of the Jews to lay stress on the fulfilment of the prophecies before accepting the claimant to Messiahship. Were the Jews then really excusable in rejecting Jesus? What are the arguments that they were not? And yet both Christians and Muhammadans hold them to be guilty in rejecting Jesus. Nay, Jesus himself declared them to be guilty in the sight of God for rejecting him. What was their fault? If it was simply a difference of opinion with regard to the interpretation of the prophecies which might be construed both ways, the Jews, though in error, did not deserve to be condemned thus outright. Unless they manifestly took a wrong course and insisted upon it, notwithstanding having reason to believe it to be erroneous, their fault would be very slight and they would be excusable in the sight of God. Their greatest objection against Jesus was that Elijah had not appeared. If his own appearance was permissible according to the Divine Laws, their objection was valid, because a promise of his return had been given to them in clear words; but if his personal appearance was not permissible, their insistence deserved to be punished. Hence, people who condemn the Jews for rejecting Jesus, whether Christians or Muslims, shall have to admit that the personal second advent of Elijah, and for that reason of any person whatever, was not allowed in the Divine Law though a promise to that effect might be found in the Word of God. But had the Jews reason to believe that such an advent could not take place? It cannot be denied that at the advent of Jesus, the Jews were anxiously waiting for the appearance of the Messiah. According to their best calculations the time had come when the deliverer should have appeared. The time of advent being established, it was their duty to refrain from demanding a literal fulfilment of the words of prophecies. But their materialistic spirit could not yield to the spiritual explanations given by Jesus. They were bent low upon worldliness and hence they expected everything to be fulfilled literally and materially. The coming

of Elijah the prophet could have been easily understood to mean the advent of one in his spirit and power, for they knew well that it was against the Divine Law, that a prophet should come down from heaven, nor was there a single instance of it in the history of the Jewish religion. Every prophet was born of mortal parents. Even Moses, the Law-giver, was no exception. These and similar other considerations could have easily led them to the conclusion that the advent of Elijah only meant the advent of one in his spirit and power, and that, therefore, Jesus was right in thus interpreting the prophecy relating to his advent before the commencement of the Messianic era.

It should however be borne in mind that in thus condemning the Jews for the rejection of Jesus, we assume it as a Divine Law that a personal and literal second advent of a person who has left the world never takes place, and that such a promise is to be construed spiritually. If the second advent of a person were permissible in Divine Law, the Jews who rejected Jesus will have to be declared free from the least blame. But the Jews are not free, nor is such an adven t possible. Any one who holds the contrary in the latter proposition, must hold the same in the former. If second advent was permissible, why were the Jews condemned without any fault on their part. They found it written in what had been given to them as the Word of God that Elijah the prophet would come a second time. They were not told that the like of Elijah would come. Nor did Jesus inform them of any error in their belief respecting the second advent of Elias. He did not deny that the prophecy plainly spoke of the advent of Elijah himself, but he told them that his second advent had taken place in the person of John who came in his spirit and power. The second advent was, therefore, to be understood only as the second advent of the spiritual part of the man and not the second advent of his physical part or body. It is the spirit that lives and not the body and, therefore, the spirit might come back. We do not mean soul by the spirit, nor are we advocating the theory of transmigration, but we take it exactly in the same light in which Jesus took it.

Let us turn now to the discussion of the question of the second advent of the Messiah, or of Jesus as the Christians would have it. The prophecy as given in the Christian Scriptures is exactly like the one we have just been considering. Matthew says:—

"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even

unto the west; so shall also the coming of the son of man be..... Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24: 27-31).

Compare this prophecy of the second advent of Jesus with the prophecies relating to the advent of the first Messiah, as uttered by the Israelite prophets and given to the Jews.

" Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple.....For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up.....and ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this.....Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," (Malachi: 3 and 4). " Behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about.....In that day saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness.....Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives.....and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley, and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north and half of it toward the south.....And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear nor dark.....And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea.....and the Lord shall be king over all the earth ..... and the wealth of all the heathen round about shall be gathered together, gold, and silver, and apparel,

in great abundance." (Zech. 12 and 14). "In those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, we will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you" (Zech. 8: 23.)

Similar other prophecies promising wonders in the Messianic age abound in the Jewish sacred books, and yet not a single one of these wonders was manifested at the advent of Jesus, and not a single expectation of the Jews was fulfilled. Yet between these wonders and those promised for the second advent of Jesus, no line can be drawn. No sensible person would ascribe such an inconsistency to Jesus as that while refusing to manifest to the Jews those promised wonders and visible signs and telling them to take all promises metaphorically, he promised to his disciples similar wonders and similar visible signs to be taken literally, regarding the second advent of the Messiah. Nay, it would not be an inconsistency, but an intentional deception practised upon the people. When a conscientious man explains certain wonders and signs as merely metaphorical descriptions of spiritual phenomena, he must be understood to be talking metaphorically when he himself speaks of the occurrence of similar wonders and phenomena. If the Jews were culpable in rejecting Jesus, the conclusion is unavoidable that the wonders relating to the second advent must be construed metaphorically, and if they were not, the claim of Jesus to Messiahship was false. Why condemn the poor Jews if we ourselves must wait for the fulfilment of similar signs and wonders literally and not metaphorically, physically and not spiritually. The path of the Jews was no doubt obscure, but ours has been rendered clear by the example of the Jews themselves. They were not in a position to see so clearly the truth of the spiritual interpretation as we are. They had no example to guide them in that great difficulty, but we have an example. All those who believe Jesus to be the Messiah—leaving out of consideration the question of his divinity for the present and taking him as he was expected (as a man and not as a God) and as he actually appeared to the people at the time—are constrained to believe that his second advent must take place in the same manner as was the second advent of Elijah, and the wonders relating to it must be taken spiritually as were taken the wonders relating

to the advent of the first Messiah. By not sending Elijah as promised, God has made His meaning clear when He speaks of the second advent of a person. If a physical second advent were permissible in the Divine Law, the Jews were entitled to have Elijah back among them, and until that time were quite right in condemning every claimant to Messiahship as an impostor. But the condemnation of the Jews involves a condemnation of the belief that Jesus himself will come back; and the wonders that are expected at his advent must be taken to be spiritual phenomena, for they have been proved as such by the appearance of Jesus himself. If the first Messiah could come without the manifestation of a single wonder, although a host of such wonders had been promised, why cannot the second Messiah make his entrance into the world in the ordinary way, and why should we make ourselves fools in the eyes of all sensible men by looking in vain to the clouds, and thus ourselves remain in the clouds? Let us turn our eyes in the right direction that we may walk in light and see the true Messiah.

If it be said that the hearts of the Jews were turned to wickedness and that their narrow ritualism did not allow them to understand heavenly things aright, the same objection is to be met with in the present case. We could amply quote from Christian writings, showing that the Church is at present marked by the same narrow spirit of ritualism and involved in the same evils as was the saynagogue at the advent of Jesus, but we will content ourselves with a few quotations from the Bible only. "But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money boastful, haughty, railers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, without self-control, traitors, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." (2 Tim. 3: 1-4). "When the son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18: 8). "Holding a form of godliness but having denied the power thereof." Does not this reveal a worse condition than that of the Jews? Are men devoid of faith and bent low upon earth, capable of understanding heavenly things and a right interpretation of the prophecies?

Did the Jews intentionally reject the blessing for which they were so anxiously waiting? No sensible person would hold this

opinion. They were surrounded with difficulties at the time and keenly felt the necessity of Divine help. They were ready to hail their deliverer and were impatiently waiting for his appearance. They were God's chosen people. Innumerable blessings had been promised to them upon the acceptance of the Messiah. Nay, the very idea that a Messiah would appear among them was a comfort to them amid all their troubles. Jerusalem, that beloved city, to be made the centre of the world, the Jews to be raised above every people, peace and security to be restored for ever; how pleasing the idea and how rapturous the delight! Could these men reject this blessing intentionally? That is a cruel idea, to say the least of it. No; they remained involved in a serious error as to the true significance of the prophecies. Even assuming that they were excusable for having fallen into such an error, not the slightest excuse is left for this generation for falling into the same error again. The people to whom every blessing had been promised, who were termed as God's chosen people, were condemned for falling into an error; let us take care that we are not making the same error over again. We have seen the fulfilment of the signs with our eyes, we know that this is the time; let not then a literal interpretation of the word of prophecy be a hinderance in our way, for we know too well that adherence to such a literal interpretation brought a people to destruction before us. To await a physical and personal advent of the same Jesus as the Jews waited for a physical and personal advent of the same Elijah, is to follow the footsteps of a people condemned by Jesus himself for adhering to such a literal significance of prophecies.

Several other considerations lead to the same conclusion, *viz.*, that the second Messiah, though spiritually one with the first Messiah, is not physically the same person who lived and died before. In the Gospels Jesus likens his advent to that of a thief. This shows that there will be some obscurity attending it. If the prophecies mentioned above are to be taken literally, the existence of any such obscurity is impossible. A person descending from heaven and met by an army of the elect in mid-heavens, can hardly be said to be coming like a thief. The thief is hidden from every eye except perhaps the eye of the watchman who is awake when the whole world sleeps. The sleepers cannot know or recognise the thief. Besides coming in the dark, the thief comes in disguise. So must Jesus

come. Those who trust to his glorious descent from the clouds are really the sleepers while the watchmen are the few who understand the true interpretation of the prophecies. Moreover being spiritually the same man (as John was spiritually Elijah) he comes in the person of a different man, and for putting on this disguise his advent is likened to that of a thief.

Another verse that deserves to be noticed in this connection is Luke 17: 26. "And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the son of man." What happened in the days of the Noah, was this that Noah announced himself a messenger of God but was rejected, and preached to the people but was not listened to and therefore God avenged Himself upon the wicked generation by bringing destruction upon them. So must it happen in the days of the son of man. Mark that it is not at his advent but *in his days.* He will come and will not be recognised, he will preach and will not be listened to but will be persecuted instead, and ultimately Divine wrath will overtake the people for this wickedness. As the *days of Noah* do not mean the hour of his advent, for the deluge did not destroy the people until Noah had preached to them for a long time, so the *days of the son of man* do not mean the hour of his advent, but the time during which he preaches to the people until they are destroyed by the wrath of God. Thus it is further on stated: "They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage until the day....." and this was done notwithstanding Noah's preaching. His word was not heeded. The same thing will happen when the Messiah will preach during the last days. "In that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left." All this refers to the vengeance of heaven brought down upon the people in the form of plague for not heeding the word of the Messiah. God does not punish a people until His word has been preached to them through a messenger and until clear signs have been shown to them. How can it be that the people will be smitten with wrath from heaven without ever obtaining a chance to mend themselves. Such has never been the Divine Law since the world began.

Matthew 17: 12 is another evidence. "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the son of man suffer of them." Here Jesus refers to the coming of Elias and that is his second coming in the person of John we all know. But though Elias had come a second time as predicted, yet the Jews did not recognise him and therefore persecuted him. *Likewise* must Jesus suffer. Here he plainly refers to his suffering in the second advent, because Elias to whom he likens his case, was then suffering in his second advent. As he was not recognised though in the words of Jesus he had come a second time, in the same way was Jesus to suffer when coming a second time like Elias, *i.e.*, not in his own person but in the person of some one else.

To be continued.

An Appeal to the Universities,

OR

Christianity in a Strait.

We take the following from the Cambridge Chronicle of 31st July 1903 :—

"The following appeal has been forwarded to the Chancellors of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

"In India the position of the Bible and Christianity is most menacing, owing to the spread of the Higher Critical theories which are now shown there as emanating from English Universities. The native press, notably the Punjab '*Review of Religions*,' shows publicly that such teaching is actively anti-Christian, and certainly inferior to the Quran in truthfulness, and therefore in morality. Similar statements and complaints come from Bengal, Syria, Australia and other parts of the world. The position of Christian Missionaries is almost grotesque ; teaching from the Christian Bible whose truth is denied at the headquarters of Christianity, the Universities themselves. And though all such denials of Higher Critical theories are being shown in this country to be groundless, in the light of deeper knowledge, more recent discovery, and more expert science in all branches of Biblical

Criticism, linguistic, archæological, literary, historical, and over and above all this, in physical science itself—yet these denials of the truth of the Bible have gone forth from the Universities to the world, until the Bible is now held up to natives by thoughtful Muhammadans, as teaching no more than the Quran, and, as far as truthfulness is concerned, demonstrably inferior to the Quran, the truthfulness of which is not questioned by its adherents. It is all very well for this country now to have been put in possession of the scientific refutations of these Higher Critical theories, and to have acquired these scientific refutations independently, and chiefly outside the Universities: and whether or no this position is recognised at the Universities, it is a position which is becoming widely recognised through this country, owing to the spread of more mature knowledge contained in the many recent expert works on the whole subject. But if the University endowments are still to be diverted from upholding Christianity, and if the official channels of the Universities continue to be used for denying the truth of the standard authority for Christianity, the Bible, or for diluting the strength down to that of the Quran, then a public appeal must lie to the Chancellors of the Universities: for the Universities are, in the highest sense, a national heritage and the embodiment of that Christian education which is enshrined in the University motto *Dominus illuminatio mea:* and for the Universities to persist in a course of teaching which is recognised by the very heathen—to convert whom to Christianity, this country sends out Missionaries—as in no way differing from *Allah illuminatio mea*, is absolutely, entirely *ultra vires*, and constitutes an active breach of the University statutes. The immense correspondence on this subject in the secular, no less than the religious press, discloses the fact that full and detailed knowledge is becoming general as to the scientific grounds on which the conclusions of the Higher Critics are now seen to have been mistaken, and beyond question, the credit of the Universities, as "centres of religious and useful learning" will be seriously impaired if they continue to pursue a course of destructive Biblical criticism, which the country recognises now to have been a mistaken course. Above all, the tranc-fer by the Universities of allegiance from God and Christianity however effected, either by temporary intellectual over-balance, resulting from the last half century's discoveries and surmises, or by any other means . . . . . must not, cannot be made without the sanction of the general community of this Christian land. In truth it is a fundamental, vital question, which cannot be settled locally at the Universities, but must be warranted by the common assent of British Christianity throughout the world."

These statements of Mr. Corfe are not less grotesque than "the position of Christian Missionaries." One is surprised at the character of the objection to the teaching of the Universities. However seriously this appeal may have been submitted to the Chancellors, the position is simply absurd. The Universities

cannot promulgate teachings which they know to be false. If the Christian public has for the last nineteen hundred years been the dupe of a fatal error, there is no reason why the Universities should stick to it after it has been exposed. The Universities were not established to teach error or falsehood. To insist that they are bound to uphold the views of the masses, whether true or false, is the veriest absurdity.

The extravagance of the views of Mr. Corfe does not however end here. While on the one hand he is fearful of the "menacing" position of Bible and Christianity owing to the spread of Higher Critical theories, he feigns on the other an inward satisfaction for having "been put in possession of the scientific refutation" of those theories. He claims to have obtained "more mature knowledge contained in the many recent expert works on the whole subject," by which the Higher Critical theories are all refuted. We wonder if the Encyclopaedia Biblica does not fall within the description, the last volume of which was issued only a few months ago, and which is the result of the mature deliberation of the ablest Bible scholars of all countries. Among the contributors to this valuable production, we find the names of eminent Bible scholars of the Continent side by side with those of well-known British scholars, and the names of all these learned men are a sufficient guarantee for the comprehensiveness and accuracy of its views. It is incredible that, men like Professors Cheyne,[a] Tiele,[b] Wellhausen,[c] Schmidt[d], Schmiedel[e], Geldner,[f] Noldeke,[g] and numerous other Professors, Lecturers and Fellows of different Christian Universities in England as well as outside it, should all have been ignorant of the "more mature knowledge" and "scientific grounds" known to Mr. Corfe. It should not be imagined that these men wrote in the Encyclopaedia Biblica with any prejudice against Bible and Christianity. Their love for the Bible is as great as, perhaps

a. Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford.

b. Professor of Comparative History and Philosophy of religion, Leyden.

c. Professor of Semitic Philology, Gottingen.

d. Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature, New York.

e. Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Zurich.

f. Ph. D., Professor, Berlin.

g. Professor of Semitic Languages, Strassburg.

more than that of Mr. Corfe. In the Preface the Editors say: "They cannot however conclude this section without a hearty attestation of the ever-increasing love for the scriptures which critical and historical study when pursued in a sufficiently comprehensive sense, appears to them to produce."

It is from the Christian Universities, the seats of Christian learning, that the truth can be learned about the Christian religion, and not from ignorant masses or prejudiced religious papers whose object is to tickle the fancies of the masses. Mr. Corfe is of opinion that the Universities should not proclaim the truth until they have obtained "the common assent of British Christianity throughout the world," *i.e.*, until the masses have agreed thereto. This is the veriest absurdity. True religious views, as in fact all true scientific views, never originate with the masses. They are only blind followers of rotten and corrupt views until truth fully gains ground. Though the Clergy and the Missionaries can never be expected to denounce the false views, because to them they are the source of livelihood, but as regards the Higher Critical views of the Bible, not a few Clergy and Missionaries subscribe to them openly.

This strange appeal of Mr. Corfe reveals, however, a sad picture of the Christian religion. It is in effect an appeal to the Universities not to give a death-blow to Christianity by denouncing the views upon which the Christian religion is based and which the Christian world has unanimously held for 1900 years. What a calamity! A mighty religion that has for two thousand years held the fates of millions of men in its hands, and whose sway extends over such a large portion of the world, has now stooped before a few men to crave a judgment for its existence. A religion once so great and powerful has at last been compelled to assume so beggarly and contemptible an attitude! Even if the Chancellors take pity on it, the discovery of the tomb of Jesus cannot allow Christianity to raise its head again. Sad as the position of Christianity is at present, it was necessary that these circumstances should have been brought about and that it should have been reduced to these straits, so that the great distinction between truth and falsehood might have been brought to light. A heavenly religion would look to heaven for assistance when it is encompassed with difficulties, but an earthly system stoops

to earth. Christianity has not to cope with greater difficulties than Islam, but the one has been succoured from heaven with a heavenly messenger and re-animated with heavenly water, while the other begs assistance at the doors of earthly men. When the miracles of Christianity are shown to be fables, it finds itself devoid of means to clear itself of the charge, although it had been said that the followers of Jesus would show miracles like the master himself, but the religion which is from the Living and Powerful God, the noble religion of Islam, shows even now the same heavenly signs of its Divine origin as it did thirteen hundred years ago. The principles which Christianity has owned for 1900 years are now shown to be false and erroneous, and an appeal is preferred against this judgment to the Chancellors of the Universities. But when men left to act upon the pure principles of Islam, Almighty God sent His messenger, the Promised Messiah, to re-claim them and to re-establish the purity and truth of Islam by heavenly signs. Is it not a clear distinction between a living and a dead religion, a true and a false system? If religion is a heavenly thing, if it does not proceed from earth, it is unquestionable that the truth of its principles, when they are seriously attacked, should be established by heavenly signs as it was at its birth, and not by the opinions of men who are not inspired by God. But can Christianity claim such signs to-day? Is there a single individual in the pale of Christianity who can say that assisted by the holy spirit he can show heavenly signs in the same manner as Jesus showed? Had any such man been found in Christianity, it could have claimed to be a living religion. But no! it is Islam only which can claim this noble distinction, this only criterion of a religion from heaven teaching true and living principles.

The sad position of Christianity and the force of the attack (appearing in the *Review of Religions* for May 1903, under the heading of Higher Criticism and the Christian Missionaries) which provoked Mr. Corfe to make this appeal, have been far more plainly admitted by the Rev. J. F. Hewitt, Principal of the C. M. S. High School, Krishnagar, Nudya, Bengal, in a letter published in the Record for June 26th, 1903. Writing to that paper, the Rev. gentleman says:—

"The United Conference of Missionaries, held monthly in Cal-

cutta, recently took up the subject of Higher Criticism. The report of the proceedings has been carefully followed by an observant Muhammadan controversialist Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, Punjab. I enclose an article which appeared in the last issue of his magazine, *The Review of Religions*. It is interesting as showing how closely this and kindred subjects are being followed by non-Christians in India at the present time. And it is instructive to all engaged in, or interested in, the spread of Christ's kingdom in the world. The Mirza lays hold of the most recent and advanced criticism, claims that this school teaches what the Quran has always taught, urges Missionaries to give up teaching a Bible which has been proved false, and to recognise that the so-called divinity of Christ is nothing more than every other man possesses. It is a curious position to find the critics in. A Moslem teacher, actively hostile to Christianity, claims them as co-workers. I wonder whether the ordinary English clergyman, who in this matter of Higher Criticism depends on the authority of some great name, has realized the logical outcome of such teaching? It must result in new and serious obstacles to the spread of Christianity among the Muhammadans. The Mirza is logically right and the only answer we can give is that the teaching is as yet mere theory; but in effect this is only to ask him to wait while the Christians fight out the question of the truthfulness of the Bible. A sad position to be reduced to surely! How do the critics propose to deal with it?

These remarks of Mr. Hewitt show clearly that the principles of Higher Criticism are accepted even by the Clergy and the Missionaries. The *Harvest Field*, a Missionary Magazine, lays great emphasis on the point when it says: "We believe that it is very desirable in the interests of truth and of the Christian Church in India that more attention should be paid to the doctrine of Inspiration as the majority of the leaders and scholars of the Christian Church now formulate it," thus indicating clearly that the said doctrine is and should be formulated now in a different manner from what it was formerly. And still more explicitly when quoting "the wise words of the *Indian Witness*" as its own views, it says: "The vast majority of Indian ministers are wholly ignorant of the new views of the Bible entertained by the bulk of the missionaries. . . . . Senseless denunciation of higher criticism and contemptuous reference to the critics are unworthy of Christian truth-seekers and should cease." Should not

the remarks of Mr. Corfe be termed "senseless denunciation of higher criticism" in the words of the *Harvest Field*. Is not Mr. Corfe guilty of concealing the truth when he says that the principles of Higher Criticism have been refuted, when they are so clearly being adopted by the Christian Missionaries and the Church dignitaries. The Bishop of Bombay declared the other day in emphatic words that the Bible was by no means to be taken as free from error. There are churches—call them liberal but they are *Christian Churches* still—which plainly teach that the Bible is not the Word of God, but "a mixture of fact, fancy and fable; truth, error and absurdity," from which we must sift out what is reasonable and reject the rest. Nay, more; the fact is preached from *orthodox* pulpits that the Bible is not the Word of God. The truth is that the mighty revolution in Biblical Criticism, that is going on in the west, is not at all discarded by the Church or the Evangelists. On the other hand, it is the doctrine of verbal inspiration and of the inerrancy of the text of scripture that is now rejected by every sensible person, as in justice it ought to have been. Mr. Hewitt's remark that the new doctrine is as yet a mere theory, cannot be accepted as true. All intelligent thinkers and most high Church officials as well as Christian Missionaries are agreed that the Bible is not free from error. The ignorant masses may still stick to the old doctrine but their opinion has no value when compared with the great thinkers and leading churchmen.

And here we cannot help drawing the reader's attention to an important point. Admitting for the sake of argument Mr. Hewitt's view that the two parties, *viz.*, those advocating the inerrancy of the Bible and those rejecting its verbal inspiration are still in a state of contention, and that we must wait till one of them comes off victorious, or even supposing for a while that Mr. Corfe has really got in hand a "scientific refutation" of the Higher Biblical Criticism, does not the question ever present itself to the minds of these or other thinkers, why is the Bible itself silent on the point? Putting off for the present the question of varying manuscripts and differing translations, which destroy the whole value of the claim of the Bible to a heavenly origin, the idea is grotesque that the weight of opinion on one side or the other can decide the question of the Divine origin of the book. Can such a book be from God, the truth

of which is to be decided by the opinions of a few men? How can the book claim any respect whose followers fall out on the question of its origin and think of settling the matter by votes? One need not laugh at the simplicity of the Icelanders who decided the question of the adoption of Christianity by putting the matter to votes in the national parliament, and the whole population adopted the Christian religion owing to the majority having raised their hands in favor of it, when a similar question awaits a similar solution even among the civilized Christians of the twentieth century. May we suggest that to have the matter decided early and not to keep the public long in waiting, the question of the inspiration of the Bible may be put to votes in the House of Commons as that assembly represents the whole English nation, and the decision to which that House comes may be made known at an early date, so that the friends and foes of Christianity may no longer remain in suspense. Such is the fate of the book which has for two thousand years been regarded blindly as the true and unerring Word of God. It never occurred to its followers that to regard a book as having a Divine origin and as being free from error which is itself silent on the point is to set up for it a claim which it does not deserve, and the error of which must sooner or later be exposed. It is folly to take a book as being the Word of God which neither makes any assertion to that effect nor gives any argument in support of that claim. The Holy Quran is the only Book in the world which has clearly and emphatically asserted its Divine origin and given conclusive arguments showing the truth of that assertion. It has repeatedly asserted that it is a Book sent and revealed by God, that it is pure and unmixed truth, that falsehood cannot come to it, and that every word of it is free from error. It has also given numerous arguments in support of this assertion to one of which only, for sake of brevity, we here draw the reader's attention. In the very first *Sura* the Holy Quran says, and the same is repeatedly affirmed in the other chapters': وان كنتم في ريب مما نزلنا على عبدنا فاتوا بسورة من مثله وادعوا شهداءكم من دون الله ان كنتم صادقين "And if you be in doubt as to that which we have sent down to Our servant, (*i.e.*, the Quran), then produce a *sura* like it, and summon your assistants besides God, if you are men of truth"; and then adds . . . فان لم تفعلوا ولن تفعلوا "But if ye do it not, and *by no means shall*

ye do it . . . . ." This is a plain assertion and a plain argument of the Divine source of the Holy Book, and it has stood unanswered for thirteen hundred years. The Christians or any other people may reject the Holy Book, but every sensible person can see that their rejection stands condemned so long as they do not produce a like of the Holy Quran. The whole world may gather together but it is impossible that the like of the Holy Quran should be made. Not only did the Arabs show conclusively their inability to produce the like of the Quran and thus give irrefutable evidence of the truth of its claim, but millions of men to whom the Quran has been proclaimed during thirteen hundred years have also shown by their acquiescence in this claim of the Holy Book that the Quran proceeds from a superhuman power. Does the Bible make a similar claim or furnish a similar proof? Why should have its followers fought over the question of its origin if it had given some conclusive proof of its Divine origin? We have given here only one argument of the truth of the Quran simply to show that even if the majority votes for the Divine origin of the Bible, still no sensible person can put his trust for salvation in a book which is to be taken or rejected according to the caprice of a few men.

Only one thing more with regard to the remarks in the Cambridge Chronicle. Mr. Corfe seriously misrepresents the Muslims when he says that "the Bible is now held up to natives by thoughtful Muhammadans, as teaching no more than the Quran." Muslims have *always* held that the Bible is far inferior in its teaching to the Holy Quran. The Christians have now begun to see what the Muslims have *always* held, *viz.*, that the Bible is not free from errors. The Christians persistently opposed this view until time has brought home to them the truth. They may comfort themselves for a while by thinking that this is a theory as yet or that they have got a refutation of it in hand, but they will soon discover that this is an empty solace, and the Bible falls never to rise again as was predicted by the Holy Prophet. The Promised Messiah has come and with his advent every falsehood must vanish and truth prevail. Thus it had been foretold and thus will it come to pass.

The Fall of Christianity.

Notwithstanding all the efforts of the Christian Missionaries to evangelise the whole world, the religion of Christ is coming to a sad end by the destruction of the basis on which it stood. Apart from the discovery of the tomb of Jesus at Srinagar which deals a death-blow to every Christian claim, the Resurrection which has always been regarded as the central dogma of Christianity, is frankly denied by all the advanced Christian thinkers and the ablest Bible scholars. In proof of this statement, we give several quotations from the most recent publication containing the views of the great Bible scholars of the world, *viz.*, the fourth volume of the Encyclopaedia Biblica. As to the importance of this doctrine in the Christian faith, we cull the following from its introductory remarks on the Resurrection and Ascension narratives :—

"The Resurrection of Jesus is held to be the central fact upon which the Christian Church rests. Even at a date so early as that of I Cor. Paul treats it as such in an elaborate discussion. . . . . It seems accordingly in logic inevitable that if at any time it should come to be recognised that the resurrection of Jesus never happened, the Christian faith with respect to all the points just mentioned would necessarily come to an end. . . . . The reason for dreading all these dangers is that upon the assumption of the resurrection of Jesus . . . are based propositions which are fundamental to the Christian faith,—propositions concerning God and His relation to men upon the truth of which no less an issue depends than the salvation of mankind." Consider this mighty superstructure and then cast a glance at the empty basis. The Encyclopaedia Biblica says on this point: "Yet what is this basis? It consists in an affirmation regarding a fact in history which is known to us only through tradition, and accordingly is open to historical criticism just as any other fact is. Indeed . . . . . we find that the resurrection of Jesus—as is not surprising in view of its supernatural character—is in very many quarters and with growing distinctness characterized as unhistorical, and that not merely when it is conceived of as having been a revivification of the dead body of Jesus, but also when it is defended in some spiritua-

listic form." In what light such an accident is to be read and with what evidence is then stated. "The normal procedure of the historian accordingly in dealing with the events of the past, will be in the first instance to try whether a non-miraculous explanation will serve, and to come to the other conclusion only on the strength of quite unexceptionable testimony."

As to the sources of evidence, the Gospel-narratives are taken first of all. "These, however, exhibit contradictions of the most glaring kind. Reimarus enumerated ten contradictions; but in reality their number is much greater." Of the extra-canonical sources, "several are often regarded as superior to the canonical in antiquity; so, for example, the Gospel of the Hebrews." But this too is not wanting in "bold contradictions to the canonical Gospels." "In the fragment of the Gospel of Peter discovered in 1892, various scholars, and particularly Harnack, have discerned a maximum of really ancient matter ('a first-class source')." There is much here that is incredible and the element "that admits of being regarded as especially old is that the first appearance of Jesus occurs in Galilee and to Peter. . . . . Furthermore it might seem to be original here that the first appearance does not occur until more than eight days after the death of Jesus." A "Coptic book of anti-Gnostic tendency, found at Akhmim" reports "the conversation of risen Jesus with his disciples." "It contains much that is new, but nothing that could claim greater credibility than the canonical Gospels." There are other isolated extra-canonical details. According to one of these "Jesus gives what is left from what he ate (fish and honeycomb) to the disciples." Another apocryphal work now found in a Georgian translation, relates that Joseph of Arimathaea was the first person to whom Jesus appeared.

Jesus remained for forty days upon earth according to the narrative of the Acts. But "according to the Valentinians and Ophites, Jesus remained on earth for eighteen months after his resurrection; so also in the Ethiopic text; according to *Pistis Sophia*, I, eleven years." The first appearance of Jesus to the apostles happened at Galilee, for it could not have happened both at Galilee and at Jerusalem. Traditions which make them happen at Galilee and Jerusalem respectively cannot be equally valid. Many

reasons are given that Galilee could have been changed into Jerusalem but not *vice versa*. "If Mk. and Mt. had to fall back on their own powers of conjecture, where else were they to look for appearances if not in Jerusalem where the grave, the women, and the disciples were? Thus the tradition which induced them to place the appearances in Galilee, must have been one of very great stability."

Several incidents on which the resurrection is based are then shown to be unhistorical. The nature of the resurrection-body is then discussed and all miraculous explanations as to Jesus' appearance after the crucifixion are rejected. Of the non-miraculous explanations, the two following are mentioned while the writer himself sticks to the view of "subjective vision." The hypothesis is rejected "that, although Jesus did not recover, the disciples spread abroad, and found credence for, the rumour that he was alive. Apart from all other difficulties, such a hypothesis is from the outset untenable for two reasons." The other non-miraculous explanation now remains to be considered. "The hypothesis that Jesus was only apparently dead found many supporters in the days of rationalism, and it has also been espoused by a writer so modern as Hase." But Professor Schmiedel does not accept this view and advances the theory that the seeing of Jesus by the disciples was only a subjective vision which he himself explains to be "a product of the mental condition of the seer." Apart from the discovery of the Ointment of Jesus and his tomb at Srinagar,—facts which settle conclusively that Jesus did not die upon the cross—, the evidence of the Gospels themselves is strongly in favor of the explanation of apparent, not actual, death. In fact it is the only explanation consistent with the truth of the narratives of the Gospels. That Jesus met his disciples at Galilee and not at Jerusalem as proved by Professor Schmiedel himself supports the same conclusion. There is no reason why a subjective vision could have occurred at Galilee and not at Jerusalem. In the other case however there existed very strong reasons why Jesus should have shown himself to his disciples at Galilee and not at Jerusalem? It was in Jerusalem that the excitement of the Jews was at its height against him, while Galilee was comparatively a quieter place where Jesus had no fear of being discovered. That death

could not have been caused only by three hours' suspension on the cross, is absolutely certain. That Jesus ate, drank, walked, slept and felt hungry and tired cannot be denied, but these incidents are not consistent with the subjective vision. Similarly the incidents narrated in the Gospels that Jesus walked in disguise as a gardener, that he forbade his disciples to disclose the fact of his being alive, and that the wounds were seen on his body, strongly support the conclusion that Jesus did not die upon the cross. Pilate and the Jews themselves were in doubt as to the actual death of Jesus, and there is every reason to believe that the so-called resurrection, which is now rejected by the great Christian thinkers in the sense in which it has been understood by the Christian Church for 1900 years, was really a recovery from a state of senselessness. For two thousand years the Christian Church has been teaching a tremendous error which has ultimately been exposed.

Jesus among the Ten Lost Israelite Tribes in the East, V.

MEDICAL EVIDENCE.

In hundreds of books on medicine we read of an ointment, which is known as "Marham-i-Isá" or the Ointment of Jesus. These books have been written by the followers of different religions, Jews, Magians, Christians, and Muslims, some of them having been written hundreds of years ago. On a close investigation it appears that the recipe of the "Ointment of Jesus" was originally communicated orally and thus became known to hundreds of thousands of men. When it became famous on account of its great efficacy, it was reduced to writing and was written down in a Materia Medica in Greek shortly after the crucifixion. When speaking of this recipe, the book stated that it was first prepared for the injuries received by Jesus Christ. The book was translated into various foreign languages, and an Arabic version of it appeared in the time of Almamun.

All the learned physicians, Jews, Magians, Christians and

Muslims, who have written on medicine, have made mention of this important recipe, stating that it had been prepared by the disciples of Jesus for their master. It would appear on a careful perusal of the books dealing with the properties of drugs that this ointment is particularly adapted to the cure of wounds, and is a sovereign remedy to stop the flow of blood from external injuries. One of its ingredients is Myrrh (mentioned also in the Old Testament), which is well known for its medicinal property in healing a wound and keeping it safe from corruption. The ointment is a very useful cure for all kinds of boils as well as for the glands of the bubonic plague. It has not been stated whether the ointment was prepared on the advice of a physician or whether its ingredients were communicated to Jesus by divine revelation. After the ointment had been applied to the wounds of Jesus for three days, he gained strength enough to travel on foot the long distance of about seventy miles from Jerusalem to Galilee. The wounds were perfectly healed in a very short time by the wonderful effect of this medicine. Suffice it to say in its praise that Christ healed others, but this ointment healed Christ.

The reference to this ointment is found in over a thousand books on medicine, which are well known to those who follow the Greek school of medicine; but for the sake of brevity, we will give here the names of a few books only. They are as follows:—

(1). *The Qanún* by Bú Ali Sina (Avicenna), Vol. III, P. 133.

(2). *The Sharh-i-Qanún* (a Commentary on the Qanún) by Qutb-ud-Din of Shiráz, Vol. III.

(3). The *Kamil-ul-Sand'ah*, by Ali bin Abbas al Majusi (Magian), Vol. II, P. 602.

(4). *A Dictionary of Medicine*, by Rabley Dunglison, M. D., L. L. D. (1866).

(5). *Lexicon Medicum*, by Dr. Hooper, P. 1241.

(6). *The Majmu'á Baqái* (a Collection by Baqa) by Mahmud Muhammad Ismail, Vol. II, P. 497.

(7). *The Tazkara-i-Ulul Albab*, by Daúd-uz-Zarir-ul-Antaki (*i.e.*, of Antioch), P. 303.

(8). *The Latin Materia Medica*, Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

(9). *The Umdatul Muhtáj*, by Ahmad bin Hasanir Rashidi, Alhakim.

(10). *The Qarabadin Farsi* (the Persian Materia Medica) by Hakim Muhammad Akbar Arzani; Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

(11). *The Shafa-ul-Asqam*, by Hakim Khizar bin Ali, Vol. II, P. 230.

(12). *The Mirat-us-Shafa* (M. S.) by Hakim Nathú Shah; Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

(13). *The Zakhira-e-Khwarzam Shahi*; Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

(14.) *Sharh Qanún* (a Commentary on the Qanún) by Hakim Ibn-Nafis Qarshi, Vol. III.

(15). *Sharh-i-Qanún* (a Commentary on the Qanún) by Hakim Ali Gíláni.

(16). *The Qarabadin* (Materia Medica) by Ulvi Khán, Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

(17). *The Ilajul Amraz*, by Hakim Muhammad Sharif, Page 893.

(18). *The Greek Materia Medica*; Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

(19). *The Tuhfatul-Muminin*; printed on the margin of Makhzanul Adviyah, P. 713.

(19). *The Muhit fit Tib* (Cyclopaedia of Medicine), Page 367.

(21). *The Iksir-i-'Azam*, by Hakim Muhammad 'Azam Khan, known as Nazam Jahan, P. 33).

(22). *The Qarabadin Másumi*, by Másúm, bin Karimud Din, Shastari of Shiráz.

(23). *The Ijala-i-Nafid*, by Muhammad Sharif of Delhi, P. 410.

(24). *Tibbi-i-Shabbri, or the Lawámid-i-Shabbri*, by Sayad Husain Shabbar Kazmi, P. 471.

(25). *The Makhzan-i-Sulaimani* (an Urdu version of Arabic text *Iksír*) by Muhammad Shams-ud-din of Bahawalpur, P. 599.

(26). *The Shafa-ul-Amraz*, by Hakim Muhammad Núr Karim, P. 282.

(27). *The Tibb-i-Dara Shakohi*, by Nur-ud-Din Muhammad Abdul Hakim Ainul Mulk of Shiráz, leaf 360.

(28). *Minhâj-ud-Dukan, Badastur-il 'Ayan fi 'Aml wa Tarkib-il Nafidh-lil Abdan*, by the learned Abdul Mana bin Abi Nasar-ul Attar al Israeli Al Karimi (a Jew, P. 86.

(29). *The Zubda-tul-Tibb*, by Abu Ibrahim Ismail bin Hasan, ul-Husaini ul Jarjáni.

(30). *The Tibbi Akbari*, by Muhammad Akbar Arzani, P. 242.

(31). *The Mizan-ul Tibb.*

(32). *The Sadidi*, by the learned As Sadidul Gazarúní, Vol. II, P. 283.

(33). *The Hdv-e Kabir* by Ibn Zakariya, Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin.*

(34). *The Qarabadin*, (Materia Medica) by Ibn Talmiz; Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin.*

(35). *The Qarabadin* (Materia Medica) by Ibn Ali Sadiq, Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin.*

Many of these books were used as text books in the Muslim Colleges in early times and were eagerly studied by the scholars of Europe also. There is not the slightest exaggeration in the statement that these books have been circulated amongst millions of people in every century, and that hundreds of thousands read them from beginning to end. We can assert with confidence that out of the many learned scholars of Europe and Asia, there is not one who is not acquainted with the names of some of the notable books mentioned above. At the time that Spain was the centre of learning and universities had been established there, people flocked from all parts of Europe and

eagerly learned such books as the *Qanún* of Bu Ali Siná (Avicenna), a very important work on medicine, containing the recipe of the Ointment of Jesus, and his other works on Philosophy, Science, Astronomy, etc., known as "Shafa," "Isharát" and "Busharát." Similarly the translations from Greek and the original works of Abu Raihan, Sabit bin Qurah Israeli, Hunain bin Ishaq, Ishaq and other scholars, were taught in these universities. The translations of these books may still be found in some parts of Europe.

The Muslim Monarchs were always anxious to encourage Literature and Science, and hence we find translations of the best Greek works effected by their orders and under their patronage. For a long time the reins of Government were held by Caliphs who cared more for the spread of knowledge than the extension of their dominions. They also invited learned Pandits from India on very high salaries to effect translations from the Indian works on Medicine. Thus they laid mankind under a deep obligation by upholding the cause of Literature and Science. But the greatest benefit they have done to humanity is, that under their patronage and at their cost, such Greek and Latin works were translated into Arabic as contained references to the Ointment of Jesus, and stated with an authority far greater than that of inscriptions, that the ointment had been prepared for the injuries received by Jesus. The learned Muslim doctors, who besides their efficiency in Medicine, Physics and Philosophy had a competent knowledge of the Greek language, when they translated the Materia Medica in which the Ointment of Jesus had been mentioned, very wisely preserved the word شليخا (a Greek word meaning twelve) in the Arabic version so that it might furnish an evidence that the original Materia Medica from which the Arabic translation had been made, was in Greek. The word will hence be found in almost every work on Medicine.

It may also be noted here that ancient books which have continually been published amongst millions in every century and which have served as text-books in big colleges, furnish evidence far more authentic and weighty than that furnished by coins and inscriptions on many historical points. In the latter, there is every possibility of forgery, but in the case of literary, especially scientific,

books, circulated amongst millions of people and guarded with interest and care by every nation, there can not be the least doubt as to their authenticity. Evidence based on coins and inscriptions falls far short of that supported by writings. Can any one name a coin or inscription so well known to the world as the *Qanun* of Bú Ali Siná for instance?

Briefly, all seekers after truth will find in the Ointment of Jesus a most trustworthy evidence, and if such a strong proof is rejected, all historical evidences will become worthless and unreliable. The man who does not accept a proof, based on the authority of over a thousand books, widely circulated so early and written by well known authors, sets at naught the important science of History and is an open enemy to all historical methods of research. Can we overlook such a strong and solid evidence? Or is it reasonable to question a proof based on writings, whose authority has been admitted from very old times, both in Europe and Asia—a proof which is strengthened by the testimony of the learned doctors of Jewish, Christian, Magian, and Muslim faiths?

Arise ye souls of the seekers after truth and weigh this strong evidence! Get up, Ye lovers of justice and consider this lucid and conclusive proof! Is it compatible with justice and honesty that no heed be paid to such clear and forcible arguments? It is absurd to say that Jesus might have received these injuries before he began to preach the Word of God, or that he might have received them during the three years of his public life, but by some other cause than that of crucifixion, as for instance, by falling from the roof of a house. For, in the first place, we find the Apostles mentioned in this ointment (it being known also as مرهم حواريين the Ointment of the Apostles), and there were no apostles before Jesus began to preach as a Prophet. The word شليخا also, which is the Greek word for *twelve*, is still found in these books. In the second place Jesus before his ministry was not a famous man that the memory of his injuries should have been thus kept safe. As for the second supposition, it is clear that the whole period between the time that Jesus began to preach and the time, when he was crucified, was only about three years, and according to some authorities only

one year. Now the record of this period is kept so minutely and the writers of the Gospels are so particular in noting down every word and deed of Jesus, and every event concerning him that it is impossible they should have omitted to mention such an important accident. But when we turn to these narratives about Jesus to search for any trace of any injury except that brought about by the crucifixion, we find that nothing is related or alluded to. The crucifixion is admitted by the whole world and no one can deny that nails had been driven into the hands of Jesus at that time. If any one affirms to the contrary and says that the ointment had been prepared for injuries received otherwise than by crucifixion, the burden of proof lies on him. Both the Jews and Christians agree that Jesus received injuries on the cross, but no one has ever come forward to state that such an accident, *viz.*, one that should have necessitated the preparation of an ointment to be applied to the wounds, had happened at any other time or from any other cause. To urge such groundless objections is, therefore, straying away from the path of truth. The arguments we have stated above are too strong to be shaken by such unfounded allegations. Can we set at naught such a strong proof as baffles all efforts to refute it? Had it been limited to the writings and books of Muslim authors alone, rash and ill-advised critics could have accused it as a forgery committed to attack the Christian belief. But such an idea is evidently absurd from several points of view.

The Muslims like the Christians believe that Jesus was carried off alive to the heavens. They go a step further than the Christians, and allege that Jesus was not even nailed to the cross. How could they, then, in conformity with this belief commit a forgery to the effect that Jesus had received injuries on the cross. Besides, before the Islamic faith came into existence, books had been written in Latin and Greek and widely circulated, which contained an account of the Ointment of Jesus and stated that it had been prepared for Jesus by his disciples. Again, the fact that the Jews, the Christians, the Magians and the Muslims, who in point of faith were ever opposed to each other, mentioned this ointment without any regard for their religious beliefs, leads us to the undeniable conclusion that the ointment and the incidents connected with it were too well-known to leave any room for denial or doubt.

One thing is remarkable indeed that notwithstanding the publicity this ointment had obtained amongst so many different nations, their attention was never for a moment directed to the great historical event which it reveals, and none ever thought of using it for historical purposes until the time came which was fixed for the appearance of the Promised Messiah. We can give no other explanation of this strange occurrence than that such was the will of God, and that it had been ordained from the beginning that the discovery of this weapon, this sound and comprehensive argument, which was to put an end, once for all, to the Christian belief, should be effected by the Promised Messiah. The Holy Prophet of God declared 1300 years ago that the religion of the cross would not decline, nor would its progress be retarded until the Promised Messiah, at whose hands the cross was destined to break, appeared in the world. The prophecy only indicated that in the time of the Promised Messiah such circumstances would come into existence as would throw true light on the Christian doctrines of crucifixion and ascension which would then fall into oblivion, and their days would come to an end.

Mr. McCuskey in the "Union Signal."

Mr. McCUSKEY, who is somebody in the Foreman Christian College, Lahore, informs the "Union Signal" (Chicago) that Dr. Griswold has proved the falsity of the claims of the Promised Messiah. Putting off the review of Dr. Griswold's pamphlet for some subsequent issue of the magazine, we ask Mr. McCuskey what constitutes a proof of the falsity of a man who claims to be a messenger from heaven? If simply an assertion that the claimant is false or that his prophecies are not fulfilled, is a satisfactory proof of falsity, the Pharisees adequately proved the falsity of the claims of Jesus and millions of men have since then proved his falsity. If not, Mr. McCuskey will kindly point out to us the arguments in Dr. Griswold's thirty-two paged pamphlet, showing, for instance, that it is not the time for the coming of the Messiah, that the second advent of Jesus is

to be a physical and personal advent and not a spiritual one (remembering of course how Jesus construed the second advent of Elijah to satisfy the Jews that he was the true Messiah), that Jesus did die upon the cross, rose from the dead and subsequently went up to heaven, that the arguments of the Promised Messiah to the contrary are not good and valid arguments, and that the signs of the Promised Messiah are not as conclusive and well-proved as those of Jesus, if the latter actually showed the signs related in the Gospels. Perhaps Dr. Griswold told Mr. McCuskey that he had proved the Messiah's falsity and Mr. McCuskey could not question his friend's honesty by himself considering the amount and weight of the evidence brought forward by him in contravention of the claims of the Promised Messiah. Or, with due respect to Mr. McCuskey's logical profundity, we may suggest that like his friend Dr. Griswold, he cannot distinguish between an assertion and an argument, and takes the Doctor's assertions, as he himself took them, for arguments.

But while Mr. McCuskey bases the first part of his letter on information supplied to him by Dr. Griswold, the second reveals his own ability and learning. He thus delivers himself: "As far as I can see or learn, the influence of this 'Qadiana' extends over a constantly decreasing number of people, and the orthodox Muhammadans reject him with great scorn." Mark this "Qadiana." But Mr. McCuskey is silent as to the influence of that "Nazarene" and the honor with which he was received by the expectant Jews. Is it true that he too was received with "great scorn," and something more? For true information on this point, we would defer to Mr. McCuskey's authority. One thing more. It is said that a very large number of the followers of Jesus apostatized on one occasion. Nay, more; one of the chosen twelve to whom Jesus had promised a throne to sit upon, not only apostatized but also betrayed Jesus into the hands of his enemies, and the others denied Jesus and fled from him when he was arrested. If it is true, Mr. McCuskey, we hope would have no objection to admit it, however painful the admission may be. But how did he see or learn that the number of the Promised Messiah's followers was constantly decreasing? Did he ever see any of the Ahmadiyya weekly papers issued from Qadian? Or, is it that the establishment of a College, the erection of a minaret, and the publication of one English and three Urdu periodicals within the last year or two appear to him indica-

tions of a " constantly decreasing " following ? It cannot be that he is unaware of the steady progress which is being made by the Ahmadiyya movement, but he could not win any credit from the Missionaries without making a misrepresentation. Does he think that he can extinguish the light kindled by God with the breath of his mouth ? He is mistaken.

For Mr. McCuskey's information, we may further state that it is a heavenly sign of the truth of the Promised Messiah that his following will continually increase and never decrease, as stated and earnestly desired by Mr. McCuskey and his friends. It was in the year 1880 that the first work of the Promised Messiah, the "Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya " was published, and in it were announced the prophecies revealed some years earlier of which the fulfilment is witnessed to-day. At that time not only the Promised Messiah had no followers but he was hardly known abroad. His life then was a solitary life. It was in that loneliness that the Word of God came to him informing him that people will flock to him from the four quarters of the world. He was told to enlarge his house for the large number of visitors that would come to him. He was enjoined not to get tired of the great masses that would come to see him. Almighty God addressed him saying: انت منی بمنزلة توحیدی و تفریدی فحان ان تعان و تعرف بین الناس " Thou art to me as my unity and oneness ; the time has come that thou wilt be assisted and made known among the people." This revelation also shows that at that time he was neither known, nor had he any follower. The prophecy indicated that a time was coming when he would be granted by the Divine assistance a large following and a wide recognition, And again یاتون من کل فج عمیق " People will come to thee from every distant path." It struck the inspired one at that time with no less wonder than it strikes us to-day when we witness thousands of people coming only to see the face of the messenger of God, not only from the most distant quarters of India but also from other countries. Were people to come to him whom no body knew, he thought? Similarly, he received the prophetical injunction saying لا تصعر لخلق الله و لا تسئم من الناس " Do not turn away thy face from the people and do not get tired of them." Imagine these words revealed at a time when hardly a man came to see the recipient of this revelation. At that time he could not even think

how God would bring about all these things and bring people to him in such large numbers that, but for the Divine injunction thus given a quarter of a century before the time of its fulfilment, he would have got tired of them. Thus it happens now and on certain days he has to shake hands with more than a thousand men who come from distant places to see him. Sitting in a solitary room he could not have even conceived the idea that such large masses would gather round him. Along with these promises he was told that opposition would rage high against him and people would leave no stone unturned to destroy him and wipe off his name from the face of the earth. Of that severe opposition he was informed in numerous revelations, yet at that date his solitary condition did not allow him even to conceive the nature of this opposition. In one revelation Almighty God told him يريدون ان يطفئوا نور الله بافواههم والله متم نوره ولو كره الكافرون "They will try to extinguish the light of God by the breath of their mouth, but God will complete His light though the unbelievers may feel aversion to it." And again the Word of God came with a fresh assurance: اذا جاء نصر الله والفتح وانتهى امر الزمان "When the assistance of God and victory will come to thee, and after vain opposition people will ultimately see that all power is in our hands, then will it be said: Is it not true." Here we are plainly told that ultimately God will grant the Promised Messiah such a glorious victory that the truth of his claim will be generally felt.

All these revelations granted to the Promised Messiah more than a quarter of a century ago, and published about 21 years ago, when he was hardly known to any one outside his village, show clearly the hand of God working in the movement. The truth of the words which were then revealed is now felt by every unprejudiced mind. Is it within the power of a mortal to publish in the whole world such facts a quarter of a century before their occurrence. It is one of the best proved miracles of knowledge and power: a miracle of knowledge because it shows a deep knowledge of the future which cannot be known to any but God, and a miracle of power in as much as it reveals the power of God in assisting his messenger and vanquishing his enemies. Plots were formed against

his life but Almighty God brought them to naught and fulfilled His promise which he had given him thirty years before the existence of such plots that he would be saved from them all. A few years after their publication the whole country rose in opposition to him. Then did the Divine assistance come as promised and the opposition began to subside by degrees. The number of disciples in 1895 was 313 but to-day they number about two hundred thousand, and the number is increasing with an astonishing rapidity.

Mr. McCuskey has told a disgraceful lie. We need not discuss what his motive was in telling it. Perhaps he thought of pleasing the American public by the false statement and keeping them in the dark as to the true state of things. We challenge him to produce the data on which he calculated the alleged decrease, though he has been clever enough to guard himself against such an emergency by adding "as far as I can see or learn." Does he think that the religion of Christ will prosper by such falsehoods. These are the only instruments now left in the hands of the Christian Missionaries, these preachers of the "Gospel of truth." We bind ourselves to pay him Rs. 50,000, if he can prove the truth of this assertion. If he has not intentionally told this untruth, he must admit the falsity of his statement.

The next issue of the *Review of Religions* will not come out on the fixed date. The November and December numbers will be issued together at as early a date after the 20th November as possible. This has been necessitated by a very important and lengthy contribution from the pen of the Promised Messiah under the heading of the Story of the two Martyrs in the course of which is given a resume of the arguments for the truth of his claim to Messiahship.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL II.] NOVEMBER & DECEMBER, 1903. [Nos. 11 & 12.

بسم ا لله ا لرحمن ا لرحيم
نحمد ه و نصلى على رسو له ا لكريم

The Story of the Two Martyrs.

*THE SECOND ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH.

Praise be to God, and peace on His servants whom He has chosen.

Though all sorts of outrages and atrocities are committed on the face of the earth, yet the inhuman deed done in the name of religion, the details of which are given below, is unique in its barbarity, and a relation of the incidents of this cold-blooded murder is enough to draw tears from the eyes of the most hard-hearted men. To describe all these events in order, it is necessary to explain the nature and object of the heavenly message with which I am entrusted. When Almighty God saw that the world was steeped in iniquities, transgressions and errors, He raised me to draw it from this state of degradation and commanded me to preach the truth and reclaim the world from the evils into which it had fallen. So, exactly at the time when the thirteenth century of Hejira had come to a close and the world had entered upon the fourteenth century, I announced my mission in obedience to the Divine commandment and made it known to the people through my words and writings that I was the reformer promised to appear at the commencement of the fourteenth century for the reformation of the faith, so that I should re-establish upon the earth the faith which had vanished from its face, and that being strengthened by God, I might draw the world by the powerful attraction of His hand to true virtue, piety and righteousness and remove the prevailing errors in doctrine and practice. A few years after this I was informed in clear and

*This subject should be read in continuation of the one appearing in the October number under the same heading.

plain revelations from the Divine Being that I was the very Messiah who had been promised from the beginning for the last days, and that I was also the last Mahdi who was ordained to appear at a time when Islam would be in decline and errors would prevail, and who being guided in the right path by Almighty God Himself, was destined to offer heavenly truth anew to the world, and the glad tidings of whose advent had been given by the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, thirteen centuries ago. Divine revelations and the Word of God came so frequently and so plainly spoke of my heavenly office and mission that it was impossible for me to entertain the slightest doubt as to their truth and heavenly origin. Every revelation was strongly impressed upon my mind and driven like a nail of iron into the very core of my heart. Moreover these revelations disclosed wonderful prophecies whose fulfilment was clear as daylight. Their frequency, the permanency of their effect and their miraculous power compelled me to believe that it was the Word of the same one God whose word the Holy Quran is. I have not here spoken of the Bible as being the Word of God for it has been tampered with to such an extent and undergone so many changes from human hands that it does not now deserve to be called the Word of God. But the Word of God, which is revealed to me, is so sure and certain that I have found and seen my God through it. The certain truth of my revelation is not only established by the heavenly signs which accompany it, but every word of it was found in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Holy Quran when its truth was tested by this criterion. Its truth was further demonstrated by the appearance of the promised signs. The sun and the moon eclipsed in the month of Ramzan in those very days, in accordance with the prophecy which declared a peculiar eclipse of the sun and the moon in the time of the Mahdi. The plague also made its appearance and havoced the Punjab. This visitation of the plague in the last days was also foretold in the Holy Quran as well as by the former prophets and its devastation was described to a be general devastation to which no village or town would be an exception. Thus has it come to pass in accordance with the prophetic word. Of its appearance in this country, Almighty God informed me more than twenty-two years before its visitation, and revelations on this point were afterwards granted in abundance, frequently expressing the same meaning in different forms. In the

following revelations Almighty God addressed me thus.* "The doom of God comes to pass, therefore, hasten it not. These are the glad tidings which the prophets of God have always been receiving. Verily God is with those who fear Him, (that is to say, who tremble in the presence of Divine awe and majesty, and on account of the humbleness of their hearts and their respect for the Divine injunctions fear to tread not only the paths of open transgression, but also those of doubtful rectitude, and whose words and deeds are marked by a want of boldness and by an exercise of due care and caution); and God is with those who are faithful to Him and who do good to His creatures. He is mighty and powerful; He has power over everything, but most people do not know it. When He willeth a thing, His command to it is, Be, and it comes into existence. Can you flee from Me and verily We will revenge ourselves upon the sinful. They say: 'It is but the word of man and other people assist him in the matter; he is an ignorant man or beside himself.' Say to them: 'If you love God, come, follow me that God may love you.' As for those who deride thee, have thou nothing to do with them, for We will maintain thy cause against them. I will bring him to disgrace who is intent upon thy disgrace, and will assist him who assists thee. I am God in whose presence the sent ones fear not. When the assistance of God and victory will come, and the Word of thy Lord will be fulfilled, then will it be said: 'This is what you hastented.' And when it is said to them 'cause not disorders in the earth, they say, 'Nay, rather do we set matters right'; of a certainty they themselves are the authors of disorder. And they take thee as the subject of their railleries, and say in derision: 'Is this he whom God has sent as an Apostle!' This is how they take thee, but the fact is that we offered truth to them and they hated it and rejected it. Verily, they who walk unjustly will soon find out in what direction they shall be turned. Praised is God and exalted high above what they ascribe to Him. And they say 'Thou art not a messenger of God'; say to them 'I have with me the testimony of God; will you then believe?' Thou hast dignity in My presence; I have chosen thee for Myself. When thou art angry with a person, I am also angry with him, and whomsoever thou lovest, I also love. Almighty God doth praise thee from His throne on High. God praises thee and walks towards thee. Thou hast a place in My presence which the world does not

*The original revelations are in Arabic and their translation is given here.

know. Thou art to Me as My Unity and oneness. Thou art from Our water and they are weak-hearted. Praised be God who made thee Christ, son of Mary, and taught thee what thou wast ignorant of. And they said: 'Wherefrom and how hast thou got this dignity and high rank.' Say to them: 'My God is a wonderful God.' No one can undo the grace which He chooses to bestow upon His servants. He is not questioned of what He doeth, but men are questioned of their deeds. Verily thy Lord doth what He willeth. He created the last Adam and gave him honor and dignity. I willed that I should make one my vicegerent upon earth, so I created this Adam. And the people said: 'Dost Thou place upon the earth as Thy vicegerent one who shall act corruptly therein, *i.e.*, who shall bring about disunion?' God said, 'I know things which you know not.' And they say, 'This is but a fabrication.' Say 'It is God who has established this dispensation;' then leave them in their vain sports. Verily we have sent him with truth and he came at a time when his need was truly felt. We have sent thee as a mercy for the whole world. O my Ahmad, thou art according to my wish and thou art with me. Thy secret is my secret. Thy rank is great and thy reward is at hand. I enlightened thee and chose thee. A time will come on thee like the time which came upon Moses. Do not intercede with me for the evil-doers, for verily they will be drowned. And they will devise plans against thee, and God will also devise plans for their destruction, and God is certainly the best planner. Verily God is a generous God who walks before thee and He holds him as His enemy who bears enmity to thee. He will grant thee gifts which will please thee. Verily we will inherit the earth, and we are eating it away from its sides that thou mayest warn the people whose fathers and grandfathers have not been warned, and that the way of the sinners may be made clear. Say, 'I am commanded by God and I am the first believer.' Say, It has been revealed to me that your God is God alone; and all goodness is in the Quran. The treasures of its hidden truths and deep meaning are disclosed to those who are purified by the hand of God: what tradition will you then believe after the Quran, *i.e.*, departing from its injunctions. They wish to exert themselves to their utmost against thee, so that thy affair may be left unfinished, but God wills it that thy affair should be perfected, and God will not leave thee until he sever the virtuous from the wicked. God is he who has sent His Messenger (*i.e.*, the Promised Messiah)

with the guidance and the religion of truth that he may make it victorious over all other religions, and the promise of God was one day to be fulfilled. Verily the promise of God has come and it pawed and mended the affair. God will save thee from thy enemies and He will attack him who attacks thee unjustly. His wrath has come down upon the earth for people disobeyed His commandments and transgressed His laws. Diseases shall be spread in the country and lives shall be destroyed in various ways. This has been decreed upon heaven and it is the decree of the mighty God who is powerful and great. God will not remove the evils that have befallen this generation until people change the condition of their hearts. He will take into His protection the village of Qadian after a little trial.* On that day there will be no protector except God. Build thou the ark before Our eyes and according to Our revelation. The powerful God is with thee and with thy people. I will save every one who is within the four walls of thy house except those who with vanity and haughtiness rebel against My commandments and do not bow in submission before Me. Thee I will protect in particular from among all people. 'Peace' is the word of a merciful Lord. 'Peace unto you for you are pure in heart; and be ye separated, O sinners, this day.' I will stand by my Apostle and I will break the fast and keep it. I will blame him who blames thee, and grant thee the blessings which shall know no end, and kindle in thee the light of My manifestation. I will not leave this earth until the appointed time, *i.e.*, my wrath will be upon it. I am the lightning and I am the merciful, the Lord of benevolence and bounty."

Successive revelations thus came to me and mighty and wonderful signs were revealed. Commanded by God, I published my claim to be the Promised Messiah with its arguments and announced it to the world. In the province of Khost in the country of Afghanistan lived a learned and holy man, Akhun Zada Maulvi Abdul Latif, into whose hands my books fell by chance, and he read in them the arguments in support of my claim, arguments which were deduced from three different sources, *viz.*, sacred books, reason and heavenly signs.

*The word in the original revelation is اوی, which is used in Arabic to denote a taking into one's protection after some adversity and saving from still greater adversities and destruction. In this sense the words اوی and آوی have been frequently used in the Holy Quran as the verse الم یجدک یتیما فاوی shows.

These arguments carried conviction to his heart, for he was a man of great learning and piety, and walked in righteousness and purity of heart before God. He had no hesitation in the acceptance of my claims, and he at once recognised me as the Messenger of God. He eagerly perused such of my books as he could get, and his soul which on account of its purity was ever ready to accept the truth, was drawn towards me with a powerful attraction. The mighty magnetism of truth and the increasing attachment of love and sincerity at last overcame every physical barrier. To get a license to leave Afghanistan, he determined to perform a pilgrimage to Mecca and asked the permission of the Amir for this holy object. As he was revered by the Amir on account of his great learning and piety, and had for that reason been placed at the head of the Ulama of Afghanistan, he was not only granted permission but also a donation for payment of part of expenditure. Having thus obtained permission, he reached Qadian. When I saw him, I found him at a stage of submission in the acceptance of my claim and of obedience to my will, beyond which it is impossible for a man to go. His soul was so full of love that it sent out rich odours like a perfume-bottle. His heart appeared to me no less shining than his brilliant face. What was so noble and praiseworthy in him, was his complete severance from earth and perfect devotion to heavenly work. He was of the righteous servants of God, whose piety and submission to His commandments have no bounds. In the love of God and in seeking His pleasure, he was ready to spurn worldly glory and honor and to put down his life and throw away his property like a trifle. So great was the power of his faith that I will be guilty of describing it inadequately if I compare it to the greatest mountain. There are many people who swear repentance on my hands and recognise the truth of my claim, but they are not purged of the poison of giving a preference to worldly things over the service of God, and their imperfect minds are still tainted with various evils so that they cannot give up their life, property or honor for the sake of God, and are contented with an imperfect state of morality. On account of this weakness and imperfection in them, I hesitate in asking them to perform any great service for the sake of God, lest they should renounce the promise of Baiat and thus even lose the little which they have gained. Maulvi Abdul Latif was not one of these. In his love and enthusiasm he went so far

as to discard all worldly things and renounce all that he had. There are many people whose end is not as good as their beginning and who stumble at the slightest trials or the faintest insinuations of the Devil But the holy man I am speaking of was not one of them. His perseverance in the path of God could not be shaken by the strongest temptations, and the light of certainty which was in him shone every moment with greater lustre and brightness.

When Maulvi Abdul Latif came to me, I questioned him as to the arguments by which he had known me to be the true Messiah. He stated that the Quran was his great guide in this respect. Looking at the deep moral degradation of the world he had come to the conclusion, he said, that the Muslims of the present age had fallen away from truth and were totally ignorant of what a true spiritual life was. Their lips declared a faith in God but their hearts were utter strangers to the true conception of faith. In doctrine and in practice, in words and deeds they were involved in serious errors, innovations and transgressions of the Divine commandments. He further stated that this degraded condition of Islam became the more deplorable when the hostile attacks upon it were taken into consideration. On account of the prevailing ignorance and darkness in which people were involved, their hearts had lost all vitality. The religion and righteousness which the Holy Prophet preached to his companions, and the sincerity, certainty and faith which they had, had almost vanished away. From all this he saw that Islam had lost its life and that, therefore, the time had come when some one should have appeared to impart to it a new life. Thus did he daily muse, he stated. Nay, he was daily and hourly becoming impatient because he did not hear the voice of the promised one, and the time had almost passed away. In those very days he was informed that one claimed to be the Promised Messiah at Qadian in the Punjab. Then he read the books which contained this claim and critically examined the arguments, and tested them by the Holy Quran, and found the Holy Book supporting every argument of the claim and confirming the statements of the claimant. This was the beginning of his movement towards me. He saw that on the one hand, the Holy Quran plainly stated that Jesus had died and that he would not come back, and that on the other, it promised that successors would be raised to the Holy Prophet like the

successors of the prophet Moses, and that these statements led to the necessary conclusion that as the line of Moses' successors was terminated by a Messiah who did not resort to religious wars, so the terminating link in the chain of the Holy Prophet's successors was to be a Messiah in the spirit and after the manner of the first Messiah.

In short, I heard many words of deep wisdom and knowledge from the lips of that righteous man, Maulvi Abdul Latif. He was so fond of my words that he changed his resolution of performing a pilgrimage and stayed with me for several months. He told me that he stood in need of the knowledge which should strengthen his faith, and that such knowledge was no doubt preferable to virtuous deeds. Finding him thus attentive to my words, I gave him as much information regarding this heavenly dispensation as I could during the short time that he lived here. The arguments which I produced in support of my claim are briefly stated below.

The Holy Quran says: انا ارسلنا اليكم رسولا شاهدا عليكم كما ارسلنا الى فرعون رسولا "We have sent to you a prophet, a witness over you, *i.e.*, a witness of the corrupt moral state in which you are, like to the prophet whom we sent to Pharoah." In this verse Almighty God calls our Holy Prophet the like of Moses. Again in the chapter entitled "the Light," the Holy Quran says: وعد الله الذين آمنوا منكم وعملوا الصلحات ليستخلفنهم فى الارض كما استخلف الذين من قبلهم "God has promised to those of you who believe and do the deeds that are righteous, that He will make them successors (to the Prophet) in the land like those who were made successors before them, (*i.e.*, the successors of Moses)." Here the chain of the successors of the Holy Prophet is described as resembling the chain of the successors of Moses. For the truth of this resemblance it is, therefore, necessary that the first prophet in Islam should be the like of Moses and his last successor the like of Jesus. Now it is universally agreed upon by the Muslims that the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was the like of Moses. It is, therefore, sheer bigotry to deny that the last successor of the Holy Prophet will be the like of Jesus. Such a denial is, in fact a deliberate renunciation of the Holy Quran itself, for not only does the Holy Quran call the Holy Prophet the like of Moses, but it further traces out a perfect resemblance between the successors of the founders

of the two laws. It is, therefore, unquestionably and undeniably true that the system of the Muslim successors of the Holy Prophet must terminate in the like of Jesus, *i.e.*, in a Messiah. Moreover, as the resemblance between the first and the last of the Mosaic system and the first and the last of the Muslim system respectively, conclusively settles the question of the resemblance of the two systems, therefore in the Word of God stress is laid upon this point only. Nay, a resemblance has been traced even between the enemies of the founders of the two systems, and between the enemies of the last successors of the two systems Thus Abu Jehl has been compared to Pharoah, and the enemies of the last Messiah to the Jews who rejected Jesus.

In the verse which describes the likeness of the successors of one system to those of the other, there is also a clear indication as to resemblance in point of time. In other words, the duration of time that elapsed from the appearance of Moses to that of his last successor, must correspond in length to the duration which must elapse between the Holy Prophet of Islam and the last Messiah. Now according to the Jewish account, Jesus announced himself as the expected Messiah in the fourteenth century after Moses, while the Christians think that fourteen centuries had already elapsed from the death of Moses when Jesus made his appearance. Apparently the Jewish account claims the greater credit, but even if the Christian account is taken as the true one, the resemblance in point of time marks out the present as the time of the appearance of the last Messiah.

In fact the resemblance between the two systems, extends to every good and evil which is their lot. The Holy Quran says of the Jews فننظر كيف تعملون and elsewhere says of the Muslims in almost identical words لننظر كيف تعملون, the purport of the two verses being that Almighty God said to the two people that after granting them kingdom and rule, He would then see whether they continued to walk in the paths of righteousness as a reward for which kingdom was granted to them or whether they departed from it. The expressions used here with regard to the Jews and the Muslims are almost exactly the same. This shows clearly that Almighty God has foretold that some of the Muslims would be exactly in the same position in which the Jews were, and that they would be guilty of the same evils of which the Jews

were guilty, meaning by the people their religious leaders.

The closing verse of the *Fatiha* reveals the same purport for there too by a universal agreement of the commentators the words المغضوب علیہم, mean the Jews who came under the wrath of God on account of their rejection of Jesus. So also in authentic traditions it is plainly stated that the above words signify the Jews upon whom the Divine wrath was executed even in this world. To the truth of this point, the Holy Quran further bears witness in its statement, that the Jews were cursed by Jesus and hence the vengeance of heaven was brought down upon them. All these considerations show conclusively that by the مغضوب علیہم are to be understood the Jews who had plotted to cause Jesus to die an accursed death on the cross. Now the prayer taught by Almighty God in these words is in fact a prophecy foretelling the appearance of a Messiah among the Muslims of the consequences of whose denial they are forewarned. Moreover when it is admitted that these verses foretell of a time when the Muslim priests would acquire a strong resemblance with the Jewish priests, it is absurd to assert that for their correction the Israelite Messiah would come down from heaven. Not only is such a supposition against the letter of the Quran which calls the Holy Prophet the seal of prophets, and, therefore, forbids the coming of an alien prophet after him, but it also contradicts the spirit of the holy word, for the Muslims would not be the best of people as described by it, but the worst of them if they are destined to inherit all the vices of the corrupt Jews, but are totally unfit for receiving the blessings of Messiahship for which office a foreigner would be needed in that case. If it is true that the Muslims must become Jews, *i.e.*, must inherit the chief Jewish evil characteristics, it follows as a necessary consequence that the Messiah needed for their correction cannot be a foreigner. The fact is that as some Muslim individuals have been called Jews, on account of their close resemblance with that people, so one individual has been called Jesus on account of his complete resemblance with that prophet and his having his characteristics. As the Muslims are not literally Jews or descendants of Israel, so the Messiah is not literally Jesus Christ, the Israelite prophet.

It should be borne in mind that the words recorded in the *Sura Fatiha* which teach the Muslims to pray that they may not becom-

of those with whom God is angered (*i.e.*, the Jews), would not have been needed if certain individuals from among them had not been in danger of becoming Jews. Whenever there is a Divine injunction to a people to refrain from a certain course, there is always beneath the prohibition a prophecy that some of the individuals so forbidden, will adopt that course. There is not a single instance in which all men may have observed the injunction. All heavenly books disclose this law. For instance in the law of Moses, the Israelites were commanded not to alter the Word of God, and the result was that the commandment was broken and the original text was tampered with. But such a commandment was not given by Almighty God to the Muslims regarding the Holy Quran. On the other hand, its preservation from corruption remained directly in Divine charge. Thus Almighty God says of it: إنا نحن نزلنا الذكر وإنا له لحافظون "Verily We have revealed the Quran, and verily We will be its protectors." In short, it is a sure and certain law in the Divine word that when it prohibits a people from taking a vicious course or commands them to adopt a righteous one, it does so with the knowledge that some of them will break that law. Accordingly, it would be seen that the Divine injuncion to Muslims not to become the Jews whom Divine punishment overtook in this very life on account of their rejection and persecution of the Messiah, disclosed a prophecy that some of the Muslims would follow the footsteps of the Jews and reject and persecute the Messiah that would be sent to them. No one can seriously maintain, that it was meant that the Muslims would become the descendants of Israel and persecute the same Jesus, son of Mary, who was persecuted before, for neither that Jesus nor those Jews are to be seen on earth. The verse, therefore, relates to the future and not to the past, and foretells that a person would be raised among the Muslims in the last days after the manner and in the spirit of Jesus Christ and the priestly class would then abuse, torture and persecute him like the Jewish priests of old. The hard-heartedness and evils of the Jews would be witnessed in them and, therefore, though in name they would be the followers of the Holy Prophet, yet on account of their rejection and persecution of their Messiah, they would be called Jews. If then the Muslims would turn into Jews and inherit their vices, it is necessary that one of them should also be made the Messiah, for it is a disgrace to the Muslims that all dishonor and evil

should fall to their lot, while glory and blessings should be reserved for an Israelite. The prayer taught in the *Fatiha* is in fact a prophetic prayer and clearly signifies that a Messiah would be raised among the Muslims like the Messiah who was raised among the Jews, and that some of them would become Jews on account of their persecutions of the Messiah, and that, therefore, every Muslim should pray that at the appearance of the Messiah, he may not be numbered with the Jews.

It should also be remembered that the wrath of God which is spoken of in the verse of the *Fatiha* referred to above, indicates the punishment that overtook the Jews in this world, for the punishment in the next will be dealt out to all unbelievers alike and, therefore, in respect of that punishment all men who undergo it, are under the wrath of God. In the verse under discussion, however, only those Jews are spoken of who persecuted Jesus and being cursed by him were punished even in this life, at first by a destructive plague and afterwards at the hands of Titus. According to the prophetic prayer of the *Fatiha*, the Muslims must follow the same course and meet the same fate. In other words it foretells that a Messiah will appear among them after the manner of the first Messiah, *i.e.*, he will not take up the sword, but propagate the true religion by heavenly signs and pure teachings, and that when he will be persecuted by the Muslims, the wrath of God will overtake them in the form of the plague and the words of prophecy that had been announced from the beginning will be fulfilled. The supposition that the same Jesus, son of Mary, the Israelite prophet would reappear in the world in the last ages is against the spirit of the Word of God. To anyone who reads the Quran with an impartial and critical eye and studies it profoundly, it would be as clear as daylight, that the Word of God points out a close parallelism and a complete resemblance between the Mosaic and the Muslim systems: for every blessing which was granted to the former, it has reserved a blessing for the latter, and for every evil an evil. There are those among the Muslims who are like the Israelite prophets, and in the opposite direction there are individuals under the wrath of heaven like the Jews who were cursed by the Israelite prophets. The two systems may in fact be represented by two houses having two parallel sets of buildings, each complete in itself and not depending for aught on the other, the latter having been built in place of the former when it was destroyed. The Holy Quran

does not depend on the Mosaic law for any thing, nor are the Muslims in any way dependent upon the Jews. The perfect one who comes for the Muslims comes from among them, and is spiritually fed from the blessings of the Holy Prophet, his revelation being an image of the revelation of the noble founder of Islam. This is the point which must be rightly understood and it is here that our opponents have stumbled. It was never meant that Islam should be degraded by the appearance of an Israelite prophet for the correction of its followers. On the other hand, it should feel proud of its resemblance which entitles it to an inheritance of all the former blessings.

Besides this, it is the height of absurdity to hold such a doctrine in face of all authority when there is not a single instance of it in the Word of God. Our Holy prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was asked by the unbelievers to mount up into heaven, and he was commanded to point out to them the absurdity of such a question in the sublime words: قل سبحان ربی هل کنت الا بشرا رسولا "Say: Praise be to my Lord? am I more than a man, an apostle?" If there is any truth in this answer, it may well be asked, was Jesus more than a man that he was taken up into heaven without any request? Again the Holy Quran speaks only of Jesus' having been raised to God and not to heaven as is asserted, and this is plainly taken in a spiritual sense. The objection of the Jews against the truth of Jesus was based on the ground that having been nailed to the cross, he died an accursed death and that, therefore, according to the Mosaic Law, he did not spiritually rise to God like the true prophets, but that he was of those who were damned. It was of great importance for the Quran to raise this objection before acknowledging Jesus as a true prophet and if the رفع of Jesus spoken of in the Quran, refers to his bodily ascent to heaven and not to his spiritual rising to God, the objection of the Jews remains unanswered. Such is not the case however. The Word of God has decided the dispute and refuted the objection brought forward by the Jews to negative the truth of Jesus' Divine Mission. In speaking of Jesus' *rafa*, it has placed him on the same level with the holy prophets of God and denied his subjection to curse. If this vital objection is not refuted in these plain words, the onus lies on our opponents to show in what part of the Holy Quran its refutation is contained. Or is it that

Almighty God misjudged the whole case and instead of saying a single word in refutation of the charge took up a totally different story that Jesus had made a bodily ascent to heaven? Such are the straits to which our opponents are reduced! They never consider that bodily ascent is not a requisite of salvation, and that what is needed is a spiritual ascension to God. Again, the word *rafa'* is preceded by the word توفی which means to cause to die a natural death, and this circumstance enables us to see the nature of the *rafa'* and shows conclusively that it was only an ascension of the spirit which according to the Holy Quran is granted to every righteous servant of God after his death. To assign any such meaning to the word توفی as taking up into heaven with the body is a perversion of the Word of God, for nowhere in the Holy Book or in the traditions of the Holy Prophet has the word been used in this sense, nor does any dictionary of the Arabic language thus interpret the word when as here the subject of the verb is God and its object a human being. Moreover to insist upon assigning such a novel meaning to the word توفی is to assert that the Holy Quran does not speak of the death of Jesus at all, and thus to set up for him an everlasting life. In that case the consequence would be that his death even at any future moment would remain unproved for wherever the word توفی is used of him (which is generally used to denote the death of human beings), it shall have to be interpreted as meaning taking up with the body into heaven.

There are other difficulties of a serious nature in any such assumption regarding the life of Jesus. For, if it is permissible in the Divine laws that a man may come back into this world, how is the non-appearance of Elijah whose second advent was a necessary condition for the advent of the true Messiah to be explained? When Jesus proclaimed himself as the expected Messiah, the Jews brought forward the objection that according to the prophet Malachi to whose book a Divine authority was accorded, it was necessary that the prophet Elijah should come back before the true Messiah made his appearance. They could not, therefore, they asserted, accept Jesus as their Messiah for Elijah had not appeared. They put this question to Jesus and the only answer they received from him was that Elijah had appeared in the person of John the Baptist. This answer instead of satisfying the Jews roused them to indignation and thenceforward they looked upon

Jesus as an impostor. The non-appearance of Elijah before the advent of Jesus, they look upon to this day as a conclusive argument for his falsehood, and conscious of the force of this argument rely upon it as a satisfactory answer if questioned on the day of judgment for rejecting Jesus. Their allegation is that the plain words of prophecy told them, not that the like of Elijah would appear, but that Elijah himself would come back before the true Messiah. This argument has been forcibly expressed by a learned Jewish author who after citing it appeals to common sense in man, and asks if an impostor can be accepted on such slender testimony and unnatural interpretation of the words of the scriptures. Jesus, he says, in order to make his own pretensions plausible makes his master, John the Baptist, the great and renowned prophet Elijah; and then the writer heaps all sorts of abuses on him for this perversion. Had it not been for the light thrown by the Holy Quran upon the truth of Jesus, we would not have been able to question the validity of the Jewish objection. For, it must be stated in justice that the words in the book of Malachi, really speak of the second advent of Elijah himself and not of the advent of another person in the spirit and power of Elijah as Jesus said. While the Christians are clamouring for the Divinity of Jesus, his very apostleship would have been questionable if the Quran had not come. The Christians are, therefore, under deep obligation to the Quran, and if they have the sense to appreciate it, they are bound to acknowledge it.

The question naturally arises here that if the book of Malachi states in plain words that Elijah will come back before the advent of the true Messiah, what was the fault of the Jews in rejecting Jesus whose advent was not preceded by any such sign? Is it true then that the Jews were in the right in rejecting, abusing and persecuting one whom they had strong grounds to believe an impostor? Is it not sufficient for the honesty of their motive that they acted upon the plain words of the scriptures? Apparently they could not be declared culpable unless the prophecy stated plainly that the Messiah would be preceded by a prophet appearing in the spirit of Elijah. But the fact is that notwithstanding the prophecy as wor ded in the book of Malachi, the blame still rests with the Jews. They knew full well that in the whole religious history from the creation of Adam, there was not a single instance in which a person who had once departed should have come back into the world. The prophecy of the second advent of

Elijah, they could, therefore, easily see, was worded in metaphorical language and such metaphors were not uncommon in Jewish sacred language. Moreover, Jesus could be recognized as the true Messiah by the Divine assistance which was granted him. In fact there were many criterions by which they could see that Jesus could not be an impostor, but instead of believing in him, they increased daily in their wickedness. They had witnessed the light of truth in Jesus but prejudice and mischief hardened their hearts.

This question, however, *viz.*, whether the Jews were culpable or not in rejecting Jesus on account of the non-appearance of Elijah before him, arises only in case of the Jews to whom such a difficulty had occurred for the first time. The Muslims are in a far better position for the solution of the same question. Nay, the difficulty has already been solved for them. Moreover the Holy Quran has made use of words which are clear in their meaning. It has plainly stated that Jesus died a natural death. Not only has it spoken of Jesus' death but it has gone further and plainly indicated that Jesus would not come back into this world. In the Chapter entitled the *Maida*, Almighty God relates the answer of Jesus to a question put by Himself: "O Jesus, didst thou say to the people to take thee and thy mother for two gods ?" The answer is, "My Lord, had I said so, Thou wouldst have known it, for Thy knowledge is all—comprehensive. I did not say to them aught but that which Thou didst command me to say. But when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wast a watcher of their doings, while I could not be aware of them." This answer can never be reconciled with his second advent into the world. For, if there is any truth in the doctrine that Jesus, son of Mary, will come again and live for forty years upon the earth, and fight with the Christians and break the cross, he cannot with any plausibility of truth assert on the day of judgment that he did not know what happened after his death or in what errors the Christians were involved. In his second advent he should not only see the Christians and come to know of their false belief regarding his own divinity, but should also fight with them for this false doctrine, until either its holders are all murdered or the doctrine is extirpated. A person who with all this knowledge gained upon this earth, pleads a total ignorance of the circumstances must be condemned as a liar. In this case he ought to havean swered like a truthful

servant of God that he knew well that the Christians had gone astray and taken him for a God, and that he opposed this false doctrine with the sword and broke the cross. Nay, the question itself would not be justified in this case, for Almighty God should know perfectly well that Jesus had punished the people who had taken him for God. Why should Jesus be questioned as to the corruption of the very people whom he had corrected or punished for their evil doctrine. Is it not strange that Almighty God should first send a man to execute His wrath upon a people who had gone astray and to bring them to the right path, and when he had done his duty and punished them adequately and converted them to the true faith, He should then question him if *he* had led them astray? In short, the Holy Quran clearly tells the Muslims that Jesus died and that he will not come back but that some one must appear in his spirit and power. Had such lucidity marked the book of Malachi and the Jews had been thus plainly told that Elijah himself would not come back, they would not have perished.

Our opponents assert that though the Quran does not speak of the second advent of Jesus, yet the traditions are clear on this point. But there is not a single tradition stating that the same Israelite prophet, Jesus, to whom the Gospel was revealed would come back, notwithstanding the plain words of the Quran that the Holy Prophet is the seal of prophets. A mention of the name of Jesus or son of Mary only should not deceive any body, for in the Quran (*Sura Tahrim*) individuals from among the Muslims have been called by this name. In the chapter referred to above the Holy Quran compares one class of the faithful to Mary and then speaks of the breathing of a soul into that Mary which was unquestionably the soul of Jesus. It is, therefore, clear that the name Jesus has been given by the Holy Quran to some individuals of the Muslim people, and it is plainly indicated that some one from among the Muslims will first acquire the characteristics of Mary on account of his perfect righteousness, and be called by that name, and then the spirit of Jesus being breathed into him, he will be called by the latter name. In accordance with these words of the Holy Quran, Almighty God first named me Mary, and then spoke of the breathing of a soul and lastly He named me Jesus, as is clear from revelations published in the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya.

Moreover, in the traditions it is clearly stated that in his famous

night vision the Holy Prophet saw Jesus among the other prophets who are all dead. He did not anywhere in heaven discover Jesus with his physical body. All that he saw was his soul among the departed souls in the same place as the soul of John the Baptist. Of course the living could not have gone to the habitation of the dead, and, therefore, Jesus could not have joined the other prophets without passing through the door of death. In short Almighty God has borne witness to the death of Jesus in His Word while the Holy Prophet saw him among the dead, and thus by his deed he has given the same testimony. Any one who rejects these two testimonies, will be answerable to God.

The Muslims ought not to stumble where the Jews stumbled before them. They have before them the example of the Jews and know with far greater certainty than they that Almighty God never sends men back to this world. Had the second advent of a man been possible, we stood in far greater need of our lord and master the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and his return should have been vouchsafed to us, for in it was our whole delight. But these fond hopes can not be realized and this door has been shut by Almighty God by the words انک میت "Verily thou art mortal." If this door were open and the Divine laws allowed the return of a person who had once departed, why was not Elijah sent for a few days before Jesus, and why were thousands of the Jews left to perish on account of rejecting Jesus on this very ground? But Elias did not come back and ultimately Jesus himself had to explain his second advent as meaning the advent of one in his spirit and power. This verdict of Jesus is plainly recorded in the Gospels and the question of second advent has thus been decided once for all. A wise man should not walk in the path which has once been shown to be dangerous. Did the Jews gain anything by insisting on a too literal interpretation of the prophecy of Elijah's second advent? Unbelief and damnation was the consequence to them, and those who walk in their footstep, should not expect any thing better. Why do they thrust their hand into a hole from which many have been bitten before? Do they not remember the tradition لا یلدغ المومن من جحر واحد مرتین "The true believer is not bitten from the same hole twice." They read the *Fatiha* every time in their five daily prayers but do not

for a moment reflect on its meaning and object.

There is another consideration of great importance in this connection. On the death of our Holy Prophet, some of the companions were under the impression that the Holy Prophet was not dead and that he would come again. Upon this Abu Bakr read the verse ما محمد إلا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل "Muhammad is only an apostle and all the apostles have passed away before him." From this he concluded as he explained to the assembled companions that there was no prophet who was not dead, and that, therefore, in the death of the Holy Prophet there was nothing strange or to be regretted, for death was the common lot of all mortals including prophets. Had the companions entertained the belief that Jesus was not dead, but that he had been sitting alive on the heavens for six hundred years, they would have referred to it as going against the argument of Abu Bakr, but not a single voice was raised against it, and there was a marked agreement among all the companions that all the prophets were dead. If there was a man in whose mind the faint idea lurked that Jesus was alive, he cast it away at that moment. I say this because it is possible that owing to the proximity of the Christian religion, some uninformed and short-sighted men may have imbibed the false idea that Jesus was alive, but there is not the least doubt that after the sermon preached by Abu Bakr, there was not a single voice dissenting from the belief that all the prophets before the Holy Prophet were dead. This was the first accordance in a religious point among the companions of the Holy Prophet. There are other reasons why the companions of the Holy Prophet could not have entertained the belief that Jesus was alive? To them the Holy Prophet was the dearest object in the world. To men who were lost in the love of their prophet, it was quite inconceivable that their prophet whom they knew and believed to be the most excellent of all prophets, should die at the age of 64, while an Israelite prophet should have been sitting alive for six hundred years on the heavens. Their fond love for the prophet could not have allowed them for a moment to consider any one as excelling their master. Cursed is the doctrine which is calculated in any way to lower the dignity of the Holy Prophet. The companions were his true lovers, and to them it would have been death in life to learn that their beloved prophet died, while Jesus was sitting alive on the heavens. That noble prophet was the most beloved of all the prophets not only to his companions but also to

Almighty God. It was on account of the Divine love for God's chosen Prophet that when the Christians rejected His beloved Apostle and deified a weak mortal, the jealousy of God ordained it that one of the servants of Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, should be made the like of the supposed deity and granted a far greater share ofDivine grace and blessings than he, so that the Christians may know that all grace is in the hands of God. With this object Almighty God has raised me among the Muslims. In short, it was one of the objects of sending a like of Jesus, son of Mary, among the Muslims that his supposed divinity should be brought to naught. It is as much against the Divine laws that men should go up to heaven with the physical body and inhabit those celestial regions, as that the angels should be embodied in flesh and inhabit the terrestrial globe. "And the laws of God are never changed" says the Holy Quran.

Again, no heed is paid by the holders of this theory to the fact that at the time when they make Jesus ascend to heaven, there were as yet ten tribes of Israel quite ignorant of his appearance, and, therefore, his mission was as yet quite incomplete, because it was directed to all the Israelite tribes and not to one or two of them only. As a prophet sent for the reformation of a people, what reason had he to leave his work unfinished and take shelter on the heavens. Moreover, among the Muslims, Jesus on account of his vast travels is known as the travelling prophet, but he could by no means earn such a distinction in the short period of 3½ years after which he is said to have risen to heaven. As to his expected descent from the celestial abode with hosts of angels in his company, suffice it to say that the effect of such a glorious descent can be easily guessed in the case of a people who have taken him for their God on the basis of absurd and fictitious stories.

These are all concocted stories and vain hopes. The Promised one has appeared exactly at the hour which was fixed for his appearance, and the scriptures have all been fulfilled. The writings of the prophets point unanimously to the present age as the time of the advent of the Messiah and the Christians entertain the same belief. It had been foretold in the sacred writings that the Messiah would appear at the close of the sixth thousand year from Adam, and we are now in the seventh. It was further necessary that his advent should be preceded

by the appearance on the heavens of the *zussinain* which was marked several years ago. It was also prophesied that at his appearance the sun and the moon would eclipse in the month of Ramzan which took place in 1894. There were also prophecies to the effect that at that time a destructive plague would appear in the land, and this also has come to pass and the ravages of the plague are still devastating the country. It was further prophesied in the Holy Quran and the traditions that a new conveyance would at that time come into existence, and that conveyance by means of camels would fall into disuse, and this has been fufilled by the construction of railways. It was also written that the Promised Messiah would appear in the beginning of the century, and now twenty-one years have elapsed. He who denies me after witnessing all these signs, denies all the prophets and fights against God.

It should be borne in mind that the decline of Islam which has already advanced so far that hundreds of thousands of men have apostatised to Christianity, is in a large measure due to the vain hopes entertained regarding the son of Mary, and to the undue dignity given to him by the Muhammadans, so much so that they are almost on a par with the Christians in ascribing Divine attributes to a weak mortal. The wonder is that the attributes of humanity which were found in the Holy Prophet whom they follow, and to which they have no objection, are plainly denied in the person of Jesus. For instance, it cannot be doubted that the Holy Prophet sometimes fell ill and was subject to attacks of fever or other diseases and that he applied the proper remedy in such cases. But if it be said that Jesus was attacked by fever or any other disease, or that he was taken to a doctor under such circumstances, they would be startled as if he had a Divine nature and was not subject to human infirmities. What a sad picture of Muslim ignorance! Jesus was no more than a man, a weak mortal who inherited all the weaknesses and infirmities which are the common lot of humanity. He had four real brothers, some of whom were his opponents in his claim to Messiahship. He had also two real sisters. He was, therefore, one of the many members of a large family. As a man he was very weak. He remained on the cross only for two hours with nails driven into his hands, but even in such a short time, he lost all strength and became quite senseless. Islam would never have seen these sad days if the Muslims

had followed the Quran, and believed in the death of Jesus and the impossibility of his personal second advent. God is to be thanked who has taken Islam by the hand at the present moment.

Among other arguments as to the truth of my claim, I pointed out to Maulvi Abdul Latif that Jesus had sixteen characteristics from a religious point of view. (1) He was a promised prophet for the Israelites as the books of the earlier prophets show. (2) He appeared at a time and in a country when and where the Jews had lost all temporal power. It is probable that Jewish kingdoms had been established in other countries and were in existence at the date of Jesus' advent, as the later history of the Afghans and the Cashmiris, who are undoubtedly of Jewish descent, shows. But in the country where Jesus was born, the Jews were the subject people and were under the yoke of the Roman empire. (3) Jesus appeared at a time when the Jews had been divided into various contending sects which were at bitter enmity with each other. Many of the prominent injunctions of the Mosaic law, had on account of these internal disputes and differences been thrown into doubt, the only doctrine of importance upon which they all agreed being the doctrine of Divine unity. In all matters of secondary importance, there was no agreement at all among them, and there was no shepherd who could bring them all into one fold. In fact their disputes could not be settled except by one who could claim authority from heaven, and sitting as a judge over them reject everything but truth. In all these contending sects, truth was mixed with error and not a single one followed pure truth. The duty of the reformer was, therefore, to extirpate falsehood by sifting truth from error, and in doing this he could not have the sympathy of a single existing Jewish sect on his side. It was for this reason that the mission of Jesus was opposed by all in one voice and forgetting their own differences for a while, they persecuted the new claimant in one body. (4) Jesus was commanded to preach the truth in peace and not to take up the sword, while the Mosaic system had an ill-repute among the foreigners on account of its earlier wars. The Greeks and the Romans were under the impression that it was propagated by means of the sword, and the murder of numerous children by Moses and his successor Joshua, and the subsequent wars of David

and other prophets appeared to them as fatal objections against the truth of the Mosaic system. Almighty God, therefore, deemed it necessary that a prophet should be sent among the Israelites, who by his peaceful preaching should remove the objection which was urged against the Mosaic law. This apostle of peace was Jesus, son of Mary. (5) At the time of Jesus' advent, the Jewish priests and religious leaders were morally in a very degraded condition and though the word of virtue was on their lips, yet their hearts were quite devoid of it. They observed their prayers and kept their fasts to be seen of men, and to be revered by them for their outward sanctity. Their hearts were bent low on earthly things and earthly desires and their object was to earn money whether by foul or fair means. They wore long cloaks and magnificent robes but spiritually they were naked. They fawned upon their Roman masters and by a false flattery won worldly honor and dignity under the Roman rule. They sought honor upon earth and did not care for the honor which is given upon heaven to those who walk in righteousness and purity. The chief of them travelled long distances to pay visits to Roman Governors and were held in honor by them. Some of them were even Government stipend holders and had great influence with the rulers and magistrates. It was for this reason that the humble preacher of Galilee was made to suffer for their sake and was spit in the face and beaten with stripes. He was kept in custody like thieves and culprits though he was not blamable. But he was not cared for because he was alone and humble while his enemies were many and men of great influence. It was the policy of the Government to show favour to the greater number and, therefore, he was not treated fairly and justly, but was left at the mercy of the hard-hearted Jews, whose persecutions of the poor Nazarean preacher culminated in their nailing him to the cross. Such justice is cursed upon heaven, but woe to the rulers who do not look up to heaven and do every iniquity they list upon the earth under the cloak of justice. It is said that Pilate, the Roman Governor of the province, and his wife were disciples of Jesus, and Pilate was, no doubt, anxious to set Jesus at liberty, but when he found the priests and pharisees murmuring and ready to complain to the Cæsar, he had not the courage to act according to the dictates of justice and conscience, for the priests had already prejudiced the Emperor against the young Galilean by false reports that he was a rebel and an enemy of the established

order in the country. Whatever their position under the empire, the word of the priests undoubtedly carried a great weight against Jesus who had no access to the court and who put his whole trust in God, while the worldly-minded priests had by their cunning flatteries won esteem and honor in the state. They were not true friends of the Government but they had duped it into the belief that they were its true well-wishers. For their sake a righteous prophet of God was persecuted and brought to disgrace in every way. But the Omnipotent Being that looks from heaven on every iniquity that is done upon earth and who has in His hands the hearts of men, saw the mischief of the cruel persecutors and saved His prophet in a miraculous way. He saved him from the accursed death on the cross and listened to his prayer which he had humbly offered to Him the night before; for when Jesus saw that his enemies were bent upon taking his life, he fell down on his face before God and prayed with strong crying and tears that the cup might pass away and as he was a righteous man, his prayer was listened to. (Heb. 5: 7.) He was taken down alive from the cross and when he was in his senses again and able to walk, he went out in the disguise of a gardener and travelled to another country with his mother, as the Holy Quran says: وَاٰوَيْنٰهُمَآ اِلٰى رَبْوَةٍ ذَاتِ قَرَارٍ وَّمَعِيْنٍ *i.e.*, after the great disaster which had befallen Jesus, *viz.*, his being nailed to the cross, Almighty God gave him and his mother a refuge on a lofty place which was secure and watered with springs. In a tradition it is stated that Jesus lived up to the age of 120 years, and that after his death he was given a place with John in the next world probably on account of the resemblance of his episode with that of the Baptist. He was a righteous servant of God, no doubt, but to give him Divine honors is the veriest blasphemy. There have been hundreds of thousands of men like him in the world and many will yet appear, for Almighty God was never tired, nor will He ever tire, in electing men from among His servants. (6) Jesus appeared in a country which was under the sway of the Roman Emperor. (7) The Romans at first opposed Christianity but by and by the new religion made its entrance into the heart of the Roman empire and ultimately the Emperor himself became a convert. (8) A new star appeared in the time of Jesus. (9) The sun eclipsed at the time of his crucifixion. (10) Destructive plague broke out among the Jews when Jesus was tortured and persecuted. (11) A case

was got up against him on account of religious prejudice and he was misrepresented as a rebel to the Government and as its enemy. (12) When he was fastened to the cross, a thief was also crucified with him. (13) When Jesus was brought before Pilate that the sentence of death might be pronounced against him, Pilate said that he saw no fault in the man. (14) Although Jesus was not an Israelite on account of his having no Israelite father, yet he was the last of the Israelite prophets. (15) On account of the general security which prevailed in the Roman empire, a vast number of improvements was introduced, learning was encouraged and various sorts of facilities were afforded. New laws were introduced for a proper administration of justice and the true principles of social life and science were firmly established. (16) Jesus had a resemblance with Adam in having been born without a father.

When it was the Divine will that the Mosaic system should be brought to an end and replaced by the Muslim system as had been foretold in the prophetical writings, it was so ordained that there should be a perfect resemblance between the founders of the two systems as well as between their final prophets. The Holy Prophet was, therefore, made the like of Moses as the Holy Quran plainly asserts. Moses had taken up the sword against the unbelievers, and the Holy Prophet was also compelled to resort to the sword after thirteen long years of suffering and persecutions at the hands of his enemies when the safety of the Muhammadans was in imminent danger and permission was given for self-defence. Similarly, as Pharaoh, the bitterest enemy of Moses, was destroyed before his eyes, so Abu Jehl, the greatest foe of the Holy Prophet, was destroyed before him and in his life-time. There are many other clear resemblances between Moses and our Holy Prophet, but their details require an amount of space and time not at present at our disposal. As in the case of the founders, it was also necessary that there should be a clear and strong resemblance between the final prophets of the two systems, for these two resemblances were sufficient to establish a thorough resemblance between the two systems. Hence the sixteen characteristics of the Israelite Messiah are also to be found in the last Messiah who comes as the final prophet of the Muhammadan system. These characteristics may be detailed as follows:—

(1). First of all is the characteristic of being a Promised Prophet. Although there have been thousands of saints among the Muslims, yet none of them had ever been promised to them. It is the distinctive feature of the appearance of the Promised Messiah only that he comes in fulfilment of a promise like Jesus Christ. (2). Muhammadanism has ceased to be the ruling power in the country where the Promised Messiah has been raised and English rule has been established in its stead, just as the Israelites were the ruled people where Jesus was born. (3). The Jews had been divided into various contending sects at the advent of Jesus and stood in need of a judge to decide their disputes. The Muslims are exactly in the same condition at the present day and their division into numerous warring sects calls for a heavenly voice to hush up all their differences. (4). Like the first Messiah, the last Messiah has been sent to preach his word in peace and to abolish *Jehad* with the sword. Time itself is warning the advocates of *Jehad*, that the sword cannot satisfy the search after truth. No civilised nation at the present day resorts to the sword in religious matters, and perfect freedom is allowed in religious views in all enlightened countries. The believers in the advent of a bloody Mahdi and a warlike Messiah should not fail to see their errors under the existing circumstances. Such views are in opposition to the Divine will. Reason leads us to the same conclusion. Had it been the Divine will that the Muslims should fight for their religion, the Muhammadans should have been the foremost nation in the modern arts of war, and they ought to have excelled every other people in this matter. But they are left so far behind in martial arts and the Christian nations are so far ahead of them, that it is vain to expect that Christianity will be ever brought to naught by the sword. From this we can also see that it is not the Divine will that Islam should be propagated by means of the sword. Yet there is a certain direction in which Christianity is fast declining. The Divinity of Jesus is melting away like snow before the summer sun and all sensible men are bidding farewell to the doctrine of Trinity. The Emperor of Germany has not hesitated to declare his views openly. The wonderful progress of Christianity in one quarter, and its fast decline in the other, show clearly that it is the Will of God that Islam should now become the predominant religion not by force of arms but by arguments and signs.

There is a very hopeful prospect for Islam to vanquish Christianity in the argumental line, for heaven has shown this to be the weak side of Christianity. The Christian religion is fading away and the day is not far off when its false doctrines will disappear from the face of the earth. (5). As the Jews had fallen off from true purity and righteousness at the advent of Jesus and sought only worldy honor and pleasure, so are the Muslims in this age. (6). Like Jesus I have been raised under an Emperor though he is far better than the Roman Emperor, for the latter is said to have dismissed Pilate from his office of governorship and thrown him into a dungeon where he was subsequently beheaded, probably on a report from the Jewish priests that he had contrived to let Jesus escape alive. That was in comparison with the present, an ignorant and barbarous age, while we are in far better times and under a much better Emperor. (7). As the Christian religion ultimately found its way into the Roman people, the faith preached by the present Messiah is also sure to win the hearts of the ruling people. My claim is even now read with interest in Europe and America and has in some quarters been supported in words which could not be expected from Christian lips. The various statements of those who have reviewed my claim show clearly that they are prepared to accept it and will accept it in the near future, the more so when it is considered that Christianity is losing its hold day by day. (8). The star which appeared at the time of Jesus was seen on the heavens several years ago and from this it has been concluded that this is the time of the Messiah's advent. (9.) As the sun darkened at the crucifixion of Jesus, so both the sun and moon eclipsed twice in the month of Ramzan in accordance with the word of prophecy recorded in the traditions of the Holy Prophet, the Gospels and the Holy Quran, and this occurred after I was given the lie. (10). The persecution of Jesus was followed by a severe spread of plague among the Jews, and mine has been followed by a similar outbreak in this country. (11). A murder case was got up against me and in it an attempt was made to show that I was a rebel to this government. Like the Jewish high priest in the case of the first Messiah, Maulvi Abu Said Muhammad Husain of Batala gave evidence against me. (12). The thief that was crucified with Jesus was not left without his representative in my case. On the very day on which I was discharged, a thief who belonged to the Christian Salvation Army was sentenced to three

month's imprisonment, but was not like the first thief punished with death. (13). As the Roman Governor declared Jesus to be blameless, so the English Magistrate who tried my case said in answer to a question from me that he did not lay any blame to my charge. Captain Douglas, however, showed a far greater moral courage and a far more strict adherence to the principles of justice than Pilate, for whereas the latter was filled with fear on the tumult of the Jews and delivered the faultless Jesus into their hands, the former did not care in the least for the priest that appeared in evidence against me, and thus proved himself a man of far greater integrity than Pilate. He treated me with kindness and indulgence and showed neither the harshness nor the timidity of the Roman Governor. (14). Jesus was not of Israelite descent for he had admittedly no Israelite father, but he was the last Israelite Prophet. Similarly, I am not of the family of Quresh, but am the last successor of the Holy Prophet. (15). As Jesus appeared at a time and in a country which was marked for its great physical and intellectual advancement, for the many facilities afforded to the public in travelling and communication, and for reforms introduced into laws, similarly has it taken place at this time and the world has witnessed a marvellous progress in all departments of life in the last century. (16). The last characteristic which was pointed out in the person of Jesus, was his resemblance with Adam on account of his having been born without a father. In this respect too, I have a likeness to Jesus for I have also a resemblance with Adam in having been born together with a girl. My birth took place exactly as stated by Mohyid-din Ibn Arabi who wrote several centuries before that the last successor of the Holy Prophet would be of Mogul descent, and that he would be twin-born with a girl who would precede him. I was born on Friday morning, and with me was born a girl, her birth taking place before mine. This prophecy is found in the books of that famous saint, but its source, which was probably some tradition now lost or a vision of his own, is not indicated.

The presence in my person of the same sixteen characteristics as were found in Jesus is a clear evidence of my Divine appointment. What! I should be accused of lying, and my truth has been made manifest in a hundred ways. I appeared exactly at the hour when my appearance was anxiously waited for; for me the sun and the

moon eclipsed in the month of Ramzan as was foretold; in my time the plague spread in the country as was prophesied; at my advent pilgrimage to Mecca was prohibited for a while in accordance with the prediction of the Holy Prophet; my appearance was declared by the *Zussinnain*; by the construction of railways was fulfilled the prophecy relating to my time which foretold of the camels being given up for a more convenient mode of travelling; and hundreds of heavenly signs have been shown by me. Is there a man who can show the like of it? By Him in whose hands is my life, more than two hundred thousand signs have been manifested on my hands, and nearly ten thousand men or more have seen the Holy Prophet in their visions bearing testimony to the truth of my claim. Some of the most reputed saints in India have been informed of my truth in their visions. One of them died thirty years before my appearance. He was known by the name of Gulab Shah and lived in the Ludhiana district. He informed Mian Karim Bakhsh of Jamalpur that Jesus was born at Kadian and that he would come to Ludhiana. Mian Karim Bakhsh was a pious and God-fearing old man, and he related this story to me when I was at Ludhiana. His relation of the prophecy of Gulab Shah made the Maulvies his enemies who persecuted him but he remained firm. He informed me that Gulab Shah had told him that Jesus, son of Mary, was dead and that he would not come back into this world, and that the Messiah for the Muhammadans was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad whom God had by His deep wisdom and knowledge made the like of Jesus. Gulab Shah also told Karim Bakhsh that a very hot opposition would rage against the Messiah among the Maulvies but that their efforts to bring him to naught would meet with total failure. He also said that the Messiah would come to reveal the beautiful face of the Holy Quran by removing blunders heaped upon it by the commentators. This prophecy also indicated that Karim Bakhsh would live long enough to see the Promised Messiah.

In spite of these testimonies I am declared to be a liar. The error in which my opponents are involved lies in their wide expectations. They think that every word recorded in the traditions must be fulfilled literally, and that the claimant to Messiahship must be rejected if he does not answer to the description of a single tradition, however unreliable it may be. But such a literal fulfilment of the

prophecies which are in the hands of a people has never taken place. Jesus did not appear in the manner in which the Jews expected his appearance on the basis of their traditions. Similarly all their proposed signs were not fulfilled in the person of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him. They thought that the last prophet would be from among the Israelites but Almighty God raised him from among the Ishmaelites. Almighty God could have given, if He had so willed, all the particulars about the Holy Prophet in the prophecies so that the Jews should have recognised him at once, but it is His established law that when He discloses a secret, He attaches to it a certain obscurity to try men and to separate the wise from the unwise. For the Promised Messiah to fulfil all the different signs proposed by the different Muslim sects, is impossible in the very nature of things. Every sect has in its hands a different set of signs and it cannot be satisfied until all of them are fulfilled. In fact it is the function of the Messiah as a Divinely appointed judge to sift truth from error and to declare what is false and erroneous in each sect's belief. In the prophecies relating to his advent, he is described as "the Judge" and this shows that at his advent every sect shall have in its code of beliefs a certain amount of error mixed with truth. Therefore it is a serious error to think that unless all the proposed signs are fulfilled, the claimant to Messiahship cannot be accepted. If some of the signs are fulfilled, it would follow that the traditions speaking of the others, which are not fulfilled, are fabrications and must be rejected. The Jews who accepted Jesus or our Holy Prophet acted upon this wise rule and, therefore, they were saved. They had to reject a very large mass of tradition and then they found the truth. It was sufficient for them that many of the appointed signs had been manifested, and the truth of the claimant was further made clear by the Divine assistance which was granted to him.

All these things I mentioned over and over again to Maulvie Abdul Latif, and to my great surprise he seemed to be fully acquainted with these arguments beforehand. He found, he said, numerous arguments in the pages of the Holy Quran for the truth of my claim. He was full of certainty regarding my truth and believed in me as the Promised Messiah with as much certainty as if he had seen me descending from heaven with hosts of angels. Since then it

has occurred to me that though the descent of the Messiah (نزول) spoken of in the traditions may be rightly interpreted in the sense in which we speak of the halting (نزول) of troops or of the putting up (نزول) of a new-comer, or in the sense in which the Holy Quran speaks of the descent (نزول) of the Holy Prophet or the Gospel of the coming down from heaven of Jesus and John, yet the words seem also to indicate that the truth of the Promised Messiah will be established with such conclusive and clear arguments that to the wise it will be as certain as a tangible fact, that is to say, as if they had seen him coming down from heaven with their eyes. It was with this certainty that Shahzada Maulvi Abdul Latif believed in me, and since he had seen me, as it were, coming down from heaven, he preferred the laying down of his life to deserting my cause.

In fact such light has been thrown upon every side of the question of my claim to Messiahship that it shines out like the meridian sun. The Holy Quran has decided the question that Jesus died a natural death and that he would not come again into the world. As to traditions, a hundred thousand of them cannot be given any credence against the verdict of the Quran, and if they contain any statement which is at variance with the Holy Quran, they must be rejected as spurious and fabricated. The Holy Quran has also decided that the successors of the Holy Prophet would be raised from among the Muslims that there would be a likeness between them and the successors of Moses, the last one only in each system coming in fulfilment of promises given beforehand. The two most authoritative works on tradition, Bokhari and Muslim, also speak of the Promised Messiah being from among the Muslims. The Quran and the authentic traditions are, therefore, both in agreement as to the Promised Messiah being a member of the Muslim community. When these points are settled, it only remains to be seen whether my claim to the Promised Messiahship can be demonstrated to be true. The Holy Quran has described all circumstances and signs attending my advent in full and clear terms and has even hinted at my name. In the traditions even the name of my village has been given as *Kada* and in the Bokhari my personal appearance has been described and distinguished from the Israelite Messiah. It is alluded to in one tradition that the Messiah would appear in India, for India is described as the working-centre of the Anti-Christ and it is also

stated that the Promised Messiah would appear at a place to the east of Damascus, Kadian occupying exactly that situation. Other signs detailed in the traditions have all been fulfilled, and as they have already been pointed out above, we need not repeat them here. Moreover Divine assistance has been with me in the same manner as it was with the chosen prophets of God. Nearly two hundred thousand people have been led to virtue and piety by swearing repentance on my hands. The foundations of the Christian religion are shaken and the whole superstructure is destined to fall. Islam has been divided into numerous sects and fallen off from the high standard of purity and righteousness which it originally taught. False doctrines and evil practices prevail throughout the world, and drunkenness with all sorts of immorality is in full force. The world has undergone a deep change and every wise heart is panting for a true spriritual reformer. Such are the signs that have been fulfilled and such the condition of the world. Under these circumstances, I was commanded by Almighty God to announce myself as the long-expected Messiah. The heavenly signs which have been manifested in support of my claim can be counted by thousands. The whole world has shown its powerlessness to produce their like. The fulfilment of thousands of prophecies published beforehand is such a proof of my truth that it can not fail to convince an unprejudiced mind.

In short, as long as Maulvi Abdul Latif was in my company he listened with deep interest to all the arguments for the truth of my claim which I explained to him from time to time, and also witnessed many heavenly signs which Almighty God showed in my support during the time when he was here. These brilliant arguments, and heavenly signs and the Divine lights attracted him to me with an extraordinary power and filled him with a supernatural certainty. On one occasion he was extremely delighted to listen from me an answer to an objection. It was urged that the Holy Prophet being the like of Moses and his successors the like of the Israelite prophets, there was a great inconsistency in describing the Promised Messiah as a prophet, while denying that title to the other successors of the Holy Prophet. In answer to this objection, I stated that the Holy Prophet was the last of prophets and, therefore, if his successors had been called prophets, the finality of prophetship would have

become a moot point. On the other hand, if none of the successors had been called a prophet, the similarity with the Israelite prophets who succeeded Moses could not have been established. It was, therefore, ordained by Divine wisdom that the first successors of the Holy Prophet should not be called prophets, so that it may be a sign that the Holy Prophet was the last prophet, and that thus the finality of his prophethood should be established. It was also ordained that the last successor of the Holy Prophet, the Promised Messiah, should be called a prophet, so that the resemblance referred to above, might be complete. The prophethood of the Promised Messiah morever s not a substantial and independent prophethood but one acquired through the Holy Prophet. It is on account of his being a perfect manifestation of the Holy Prophet that he has received the title of a prophet. Thus in the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya, Almighty God addressed me saying يا احمد جعلت مرسلا "O Ahmad, thou hast been made an apostle." In these words it is indicated that as being the manifestation of the Holy Prophet, I was called Ahmad, though my name was Ghulam Ahmad, so being Ahmad, I was made a prophet, for Ahmad was a prophet. On another occasion, I explained to Maulvi Abdul Latif the interpretation of the tradition which speaks of the descent of the Messiah in two yellow mantles, the one covering the upper part of the body and the other the lower. I told him that this was an allusion to two diseases which would permanently affect his health, for a yellow mantle indicates disease in dream, and that I was accordingly suffering from two diseases. While yet here, the door of revelation was opened to Maulvi Abdul Latif, on account of the great certainty of his faith and the complete transformation which had been worked in his life. It was then that he received direct testimony from heaven as to my truth, and filled with certainty, he sacrificed his life in this way unhesitatingly. The sacrifice of life which he offered up is without a parallel in the history of Islam, and such sacrifice in the cause of truth is only instanced in the lives of the companions of the Holy Prophet. His surrender of life in behalf of God is an important evidence of the truth of my claim. For it should be borne in mind that Maulvi Abdul Latif was not an ordinary man. He had a great Jagir in Kabul, and also held a vast tract of land under the British Government. He was a man of such great learning that he may be called the

chief of the Ulama in Afghanistan and was treated as such in all the great state ceremonials. He told me that he had about 50,000 followers in Afghanistan, some of whom held high offices under the Amir's government. In short, he had a unique reputation in Afghanistan on account of his dignity, learning and piety, and besides being a great Maulvi he was known by the titles of *Sahibzada*, *Akhunzada* and *Shahzada*. He had a large library comprising works on theology, history and law, and was so fond of learning that he was always anxious to add more books to it. In spite of this, he was very meek and humble of heart. For a man of such high position as Maulvi Abdul Latif had, it is impossible to lead a life of humility unless he has reached that high stage of righteousness in which a man surrenders himself completely to the Almighty. Reputation and learning are often obstructions in the way of a spiritual way-farer and a hinderance to him in the acceptance or search of truth, but Maulvi Abdul Latif walked in such humility that in spite of possessing every excellence, nothing deterred him from accepting the truth, and when he had once found it, he chose to part with his life rather than the truth. His example is worthy of emulation for all my followers and it is such a faith that Almighty God requires of them.

Below we give an account of his martyrdom, of the merciless manner in which his life was taken, and of the perseverance which he showed, and which no one can show who is not completely cut off from the world and whose faith is not perfect. Lastly, it will be stated that the news of these two martyrdoms (*i. e.*, the martyrdom of Maulvi Abdul Latif and that of his disciple Abdul Rahman) had been given to me by Almighty God twenty-three years before their occurrence, and the revelations containing it were published at that time in the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya.

The Martyrdom of Abdul Rahman.

Before Maulvi Abdul Latif came here one of his chief disciples, Abdul Rahman by name, came two or three times to Qadian under the directions of his master. Every time that he came, he lived here for several months. His faith was greatly

strengthened by remaining long in my company, and hearing arguments from me for the truth of my claim. The last time that he went to Kabul he was fully acquainted with my teachings. In those very days I had written a book on the prohibition of *Jehad*. Departing from me, Abdul Rahman reached Peshawar and saw there Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, Pleader, who is my disciple, and who had also written a pamphlet against *Jehad*. He was so impressed with our arguments against this doctrine that he began to circulate our views on the doctrine of *Jehad* in Afghanistan and to state that *Jehad* with the English was illegal because under their protection many millions of Muhammadans led their lives in peace and safety. By and by, Amir Abdul Rahman came to know of it. Some Punjabis who were in the Amir's employment, told him that Abdul Rahman was the disciple of one who claimed to be the Promised Messiah and taught the illegality and prohibition of *Jehad* in this age. This enraged the unhappy Amir and he ordered Abdul Rahman to be cast into prison and having ascertained that he was really my disciple and opposed *Jehad*, he ordered him to be put to death by strangulation. It is related that some heavenly signs appeared at his martyrdom.

Such is the sad story of Abdul Rahman. We now proceed to relate the events of Maulvi Abdul Latif's martyrdom and enjoin the members of this sect to pray for a faith as strong as that of this sainted martyr, for a man is not counted with the faithful upon heaven so long as he keeps in view both this world and God.

The Martyrdom of Maulvi Abdul Latif.

It has already been stated that Maulvi Abdul Latif came from Khost in the country of Afghanistan, and stayed with me for several months. It was at last resolved upon heaven that he should win the glory of being a martyr in this holy cause. Accordingly he took leave of me to return to his native land. The following events relating to his martyrdom have been taken from trustworthy sources and from

men who were present on the occasion. It is stated that when Maulvi Abdul Latif reached the borders of Afghanistan, and while yet in the British territory, he wrote a letter to Muhammad Husain, Kotwal, who was his pupil, asking for the Amir's permission to enter his territories or go to Kabul and see him there. His reason for not going without permission was that he had obtained license for leaving Afghanistan with the object of performing a pilgrimage, but on account of his long stay at Qadian, that object could not be fulfilled. Moreover, since he had recognised me to be the Promised Messiah, he deemed it his primal duty to remain in my company and postponed his resolution of pilgrimage to some subsequent year. Moreover it is easy to see that if it chance to one who has set out to perform a pilgrimage that he finds the Messiah for whom the Muslims have been waiting for thirteen hundred years, he cannot go on pilgrimage without his permission in obedience to the injunctions of the Quran. Maulvi Abdul Latif, therefore, thought it necessary to inform the Amir before entering his dominions and state his reason for not performing the pilgrimage. Accordingly he wrote to the Kotwal that as he found the Promised Messiah in India, and as it was of the highest importance to see him and stay in his company, and not to do anything without his permission, therefore he was obliged to stay at Qadian and change his resolution regarding the pilgrimage in obedience to the commandment of God and His Prophet. The Kotwal is said to have hesitated to inform the Amir of the contents of this letter, but his assistant who was a mischievous man, having learnt of its sender and the facts it disclosed took away the letter by stealth and laid it before the Amir. On being questioned whether the letter was addressed to him, the Kotwal is said to have denied the fact to appease the Amir's wrath. After waiting for several days for a reply to his first letter, Maulvi Abdul Latif wrote a second letter to the Kotwal to the same effect and sent it by post. This letter was opened by the Postmaster and sent to the Amir, who wrote in reply to Maulvi Abdul Latif that he should come without any fear, and that if the claim of the Promised Messiah appeared to him to be true, he would also become his disciple. This was a trick to get Maulvi Abdul Latif imprisoned without any trouble. So he went to Kabul. When he passed through the streets of Kabul, there was a rumour that the Amir had got him into a trap. It is also stated

eight horsemen of the Amir were with him when he left Khost, for orders had reached the Governor of Khost to send the *Akhunzada* to Kabul under watch. The Amir was in great rage when the holy prisoner was brought before him. He ordered him to be kept at a distance from him, and after a little while gave orders that he should be cast into the prison with fetters weighing 128 lbs. round his waist, and shackles weighing 16 lbs. on his legs. In this condition Maulvi Abdul Latif remained in prison for four months, and during this period, he was again and again told to renounce the belief that I was the Promised Messiah if he wished his life to be saved, but he only replied that he was a man of learning and God had given him a clear judgment by which he could distinguish between truth and falsehood, and that he knew me to be the Promised Messiah. He also stated that he was fully aware of the fate that was reserved for him in case he remained firm and of the distress that would overtake his family and children, but that he gave preference to his faith over worldly comfort and life. The rigorousness of his imprisonment can hardly be estimated in India where much reform has been introduced in imprisonment. Suffice it to say that it was worse than death itself. The people of Kabul were struck with wonder at his extraordinary perseverance. It was amazing that a man who for his learning and sanctity was reputed as the foremost man in Afghanistan, who had passed fifty years of his life in ease and comfort and who had a large family, should thus patiently bear every distress and sacrifice his life to his faith. He was plainly told over and over again that he would be set at liberty and that his former honor would all be restored to him only if he renounced his faith in him whom he regarded as the Promised Messiah, but every time his answer was that he was fully satisfied of the truth of my claim and that he could not deny him whom he had seen and recognised for fear of death. Of such faithlessness, he plainly told the Amir, he could never be guilty. He was not acting rashly, he said, in preferring faith to his life, but he had given the deepest consideration to the matter. Such a high example of perseverance the people of Kabul had never witnessed before.

It should also be borne in mind that the repeated promises of pardon on renunciation of faith were given to Maulvi Abdul Latif because of his eminent position and of the reverence shown to him in the country

on account of his learning and sanctity. Such lenience to an ordinary prisoner is not to be looked for in the stern land of Kabul. It is possible that the Amir himself should have been sorry to sentence to death one who was like a sun in the country, but in religious matters the Amir is no more than a puppet in the hands of the Maulvis. He feared the Maulvis on the one hand, and saw, on the other, that Maulvi Abdul Latif was blameless, and since he had not the courage to oppose the judgment of the *Ulama*, he gave expression to his feelings by repeatedly asking the *Akhunzada* to renounce his faith in the Promised Messiah.

The reason which weighed most with the present Amir as well as his late father in murdering such members of the Ahmadiyya sect as they could lay their hands on, was the doctrine of the illegality of *Jehad* taught by it. The Amir and his councillors were fully aware that I had written against *Jehad* in my writings and that my views were directly opposed to theirs. The late Amir Abdul Rahman was himself the author of a pamphlet showing the necessity and legality of *Jehad*. Some Punjabis of the *Ahl-i-hadis* sect who visited Kabul and saw the Amir, probably informed him of the contents of my books. On account of this difference, the Amir was already biased against me and my followers. Now, Maulvi Abdul Latif, while yet in prison, remarked one day that *Jehad* was forbidden, and that the Promised Messiah taught plainly that we should serve and propagate Islam not by means of the sword but by establishing its truth with sound arguments. The presence of the Amir could not deter him from expressing his views, for he was dauntless in the utterance of truth though it cost him his life.

It it stated by some of the disciples of Maulvi Abdul Latif that in his journey home, he very often repeated the remark that the land of Afghanistan stood in need of his blood. I think this remark was true. The circulation in Afghanistan of millions of hand-bills, containing arguments for the truth of my claim, could not have produced the effect which his blood has done. The drops of his blood have been cast in that land like seed which would soon develop into a large tree providing shelter for thousands of birds.

When four months had elapsed, the Amir ordered Maulvi Abdul

Latif to be brought in the public court and warned him of the fatal consequences if he did not renounce his faith. But Maulvi Abdul Latif repeated the firm answer that nothing could shake his belief. The torture which the Amir could inflict would end, he said, with this life but he feared Him who could inflict everlasting punishment. He further urged the Amir that as he knew himself to be in the right, he should be given an occasion to hold a debate on the points of difference with the Maulvis, and that he should be punished if he was proved to be in error. To this the Amir consented, and Maulvi Abdul Latif was carried in fetters to the place appointed for the debate. On the opposite side were eight Muftis headed by Khan Mulla Khan while a Punjabi Doctor who was an enemy of the Ahmadiyya sect, acted as an arbitrator. Eight men with drawn swords in their hands stood over the head of the prisoner. The debate was carried on in writing and the audience was kept ignorant of the arguments of both sides. It lasted from seven in the morning till about 3 P. M. At the time of the later afternoon prayers, the judgment of heresy was declared against the Maulvi Sahib. He was asked if he believed in the second coming of Jesus, but he firmly denied and stated that the Holy Quran bore testimony that Jesus was dead and that he would not come back. Upon this they abused and cursed the holy man and raised their cries like the chief priests and elders of the Jews before Pilate. He was thereupon sent back to the gaol with all those heavy fetters. The judgment was then sent to the Amir but the papers containing the proceedings of the debate were intentionally detained. Such a secrecy of the proceedings of the controversy is a clear evidence that the Maulvis failed to refute the arguments of Maulvi Abdul Latif, and the consciousness of their failure was the only reason of keeping both the public and the Amir in the dark as to the force of his arguments. Alas for the Amir, that he passed the sentence simply on the judgment of the Maulvis and did not care to see even the proceedings of the debate. It was his duty, if he had any fear of the great and just Ruler of the Universe to whom he must return alone and empty-handed, to hold the debate in his presence, for he knew that its consequence would be the death of an innocent man. Moreover, the parties to the debate ought to have been treated with fairness and justice and placed on a platform of equality. Was it consonant with justice to keep Maulvi Abdul Latif in severe and rigorous imprisonment for

such a long time and then at the time of the debate appoint eight men with drawn swords to stand over his head, in order to keep him under awe and in torture and thus indirectly prevent him from adducing arguments as to his truth. Nay, it was the Amir's duty to get the proceedings of the debate printed and circulated among the people to convince the public that the sentence was passed in true justice, and that Maulvi Abdul Latif failed to prove the truth of his belief regarding the Promised Messiah, the prohibition of *Jehad* or the death of Jesus. Ah! an innocent man was butchered like a sheep before the Amir's eyes, and in spite of his truth and affording proof of it, and notwithstanding his firm perseverance which is granted only to the elect, his sacred body was chopped like mince-meat, and his family and children were cast into prison with great torture and disgrace. Is this the punishment for a difference of opinion in religious matters among the Muslims? Is innocent blood thus to be shed? The British Government which is regarded by the Amir and his Maulvis as a *kafir* government gives protection to hundreds of different sects. If this government had adopted the cruel course which the Amir has taken, how many Muhammadans would there have been in India to-day? Ah! horrible injustice has been done under heaven in taking the life of an innocent man to whose holiness and piety the whole land of Afghanistan was a witness, and that only for a difference of opinion in certain secondary matters. This Muslim Amir is far worse than that Roman governor who, when the Jews compelled him to confirm the sentence of death passed on a righteous man, washed his hands saying that he did not see any fault in him. The Amir was bound to question his Maulvis on what grounds the sentence of death was passed, and what the grounds were on which such difference of opinion was to be considered as amounting to heresy, and whether such differences did not exist among the other Muslim sects, and whether they all with the exception of one deserved to be stoned to death?

After the sentence of death was passed, Maulvi Abdul Latif was again called into the presence of the Amir and told that the Maulvis had adjudged him to be a heretic, and that if he did not renounce his belief, he would be put to death. But he was not to be shaken by such threats and he was willing to die. Every new expostulation was rejected by him with greater firmness, until the Amir knew it for certain that nothing could tempt him to give up his faith. He is also related

to have said that he would rise again after six days. I think he said so on the basis of some Divine revelation which he might have received at the time, for at that time he had cut off every connection with the world and was in communion with the angels. What he meant to say was this that he would be granted a new life, such as is granted to the transformed and righteous ones, after six days, and before the Lord's day came, which was the seventh, he would be raised from among the dead. The Holy Quran has also stated that the martyrs are not left among the dead but are raised after their death. Thus it says: ولا تحسبن الذين قتلوا في سبيل الله امواتا بل احياء "And say not of those who are slain in God's path that they are dead; nay, they are living." It was to this that Maulvi Abdul Latif referred when he spoke of his rising after the sixth day. I also saw a vision to the same effect about the same time. I saw that a tall, graceful and green branch of a cypress tree was cut off from my garden and held in a man's hand. Some one said that it should be planted near the plum-tree already cut and re-grown in a land adjacent to my house. After this, I received the following revelation: "He was cut off from Kabul and came directly to us." I thought its interpretation to be this that the blood of the martyr fell like a seed upon the land where it was shed and that growing into a large fruitful tree, it would add large numbers to this sect. Maulvi Abdul Latif has by his death set an example to be followed by the members of this sect and of such an example they stood in great need. There are those among them who, when they have done the slightest service, think they have done a great deed and laid me under an obligation, whereas it is a favor of God to them that He gave them power to do that service. There are others who have not come to me with full strength and full sincerity, and whose feet are not as firmly fixed on perfect faith and true sincerity as they claim. Such men are ready to bid farewell to their faith for the love of the world and fail in every trial. But God is to be thanked that there are also those who have believed with a true heart and come to the Lord's side with true sincerity, and who are ready to suffer everything for the sake of God. But the power of faith which has been displayed by Maulvi Abdul Latif is still latent in them. May God grant the faith and perseverance shown by this martyr to every member of this sect! As long as there are Satanic insinuations in this world's life, it is a

great hinderance to a man's perfection. Many will come but very few will set such an example.

Reverting to the story of Maulvi Abdul Latif, when he refused to listen to all expostulations, the Amir drew up the judgment with his own hands and caused it to be hung about his neck. He then ordered his nose to be bored and a cord to be passed through the hole by which he was drawn to the place of execution. While he was carried in this state of torture, he was mocked, abused and cursed. The Amir with his Muftis and Maulvis watched and enjoyed this painful sight. When he was buried to his waist in earth, the Amir once more approached him and gave him promise of pardon on condition of his renunciation of his faith, but no words could tempt him to such a heinous deed as the renunciation of truth for the sake of a few days' comfort. Upon this there was again a tumult among the barbarous Qazis and Muftis that he was a *Kafir* and should be stoned to death without further delay. The Amir then ordered the Chief Qazi to throw the first stone. The Qazi requested the Amir that as he was the ruler, he should take the initiative. But the Amir excused himself saying that it was a matter of religion in which supreme authority lay with the Chief Qazi. At last the first stone was thrown by the Qazi which gave Maulvi Abdul Latif a fatal wound. The next stone was thrown by the unfortunate Amir, and after this there was a valley of stones from all sides and within a few minutes the martyr disappeared in the heap of stones. Orders were then given by the Amir for watch to be kept on his dead body because he had said that he would rise after the sixth day. This occurred on the 14th July 1903.

The incidents that have been related above, have been taken from the reports of different men, some of whom are the opponents of this sect and who took part in the stoning, while others are the martyr's secret disciples. It is probable that the cruelty of the Amir has not been fully represented on account of his fear. Such martyrdom was decreed by heaven for *Shahzada* Maulvi Abdul Latif. God knows what requital is reserved for the tyrant for this cruel deed. The Holy Quran says: انه من یات ربه مجرما فان له جهنم لا یموت فیها و لا یحیی "Verily for him who comes to his Lord as a mujrim, the punishment is hell in which he shall neither live nor die." The Amir has brought himself under the verdict of the Holy Quran contained in the verse:

ومن يقتل مومنا متعمدا فجزاؤه جهنم خالدا فيها وغضب الله عليه ولعنه واعد له عذابا عظيما "Whoever shall kill a believer intentionally, his recompense is hell; for ever shall he abide in it; God shall be wrathful with him and curse him, and get ready for him a great torment" Ah! how great a believer was killed: one whose equal there was none in the whole country of Afghanistan. O Abdul Latif! numerous blessings of God be upon thee for thou hast shown thy sincerity in my life. As to those of my followers who will survive me, I do not know what they will do.

Prophecies relating to My safety and to the Two Martyrdoms.

The following prophecies are contained on pages 510 and 511 of the *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* (published in 1880-84): وان لم يعصمك الناس يعصمك الله من عنده يعصمك الله من عنده وان لم يعصمك الناس شاتان تذبحان وكل من عليها فان ولا تهنوا ولا تحزنوا انتم الله بكاف عبده الم تعلم ان الله على كل شئى قدير وجئنا بك على هؤلاء شهيدا وفى الله اجرك ويرضى عنك ربك ويتم اسمك وعسى ان تحبوا شيئا وهو شر لكم وعسى ان تكرهوا شيئا وهو خير لكم والله يعلم وانتم لا تعلمون The first portion of these revelations may be thus translated: "Though people will not save thee from being killed, yet God shall certainly save thee. God shall certainly save thee from being killed though people may try to take thy life." It is indicated here that people would form plots to kill me and make attempts on my life, directly or indirectly by misrepresenting or accusing me before the authorities, but all their efforts will prove fruitless. Now although being killed in the cause of God is martyrdom for all true believers whether prophets or not, yet for greater ends, Almighty God does not allow two classes of prophets to be killed by their enemies, *viz.*, (1) the prophet who is the founder of a system, and (2) the prophet with whom a system is terminated. Moses and our Holy Prophet are examples of the first, and Jesus Christ and the Promised Messiah in Islam examples of the second class. It is for this reason that as in the Holy Quran, Almighty God promised to the Holy Prophet the safety of his life against the plots of his enemies to kill him, in the words والله يعصمك من الناس *i.e.*, "And God will save

thee from the people," He has also given a similar promise of safety to me in almost identical words. It can be easily seen that such Divine protection in the case of the first and the last prophets of a system is of the greatest importance. If the founder of a system is killed, the truth of the system is obscured and its foundation demolished with the laying of the first brick. For instance, if Moses had been killed on the very day that he went to Pharaoh, or our Holy Prophet had been killed when he was besieged by his enemies with the object of taking away his life, Judaism and Islam would have been nipped in the bud and vanished from the face of the earth to be heard of no more. Divine wisdom, therefore, so ordained it that notwithstanding thousands of powerful enemies, the two prophets were saved at the most critical moments in their lives. Similarly if the last prophet of a system is cut off in the midst of his work, the truth of the system will be rendered difficult of explanation. It is the will of God that the beginning and the end of a system should be marked with great success and, therefore, the founder and the last prophet are both specially protected by Him. Since Jesus was the final prophet of the Mosaic system, he was according to this Divine law saved from death on the cross, and the same Divine law has again saved me from the plots of my enemies to take away my life. Nay, Almighty God bestowed His grace upon me to a far greater extent than upon Jesus, son of Mary, for his enemies succeeded in fastening him to the cross, but my enemies were hopelessly baffled in their efforts to bring the punishment of death or any other punishment on my head by involving me in a murder case. The first and the last prophets of a system are its two boundary-walls and their destruction involves the destruction of the whole system.

There are reasons of paramount improtance for the protection of the lives of the two classes of prophets referred to above, and for the destruction of their enemies whoever they may be. Almighty God sends them to bring about a transformation in the world. Since the world is their enemy, the object with which they are sent could never be fulfilled if Almighty God did not ensure the safety of their lives. In every contest they are made victorious and their enemies are brought low whatever their number and force. The fool says, "I also am virtuous; I also say prayers and keep fasts." The

Jewish priests and pharisees thought the same, and some of them even claimed to be the recipients of Divine revelation in opposition to Jesus. But this was not sufficient for their protection or the destruction of Jesus. The true and faithful servants of God have such close connection with Him, and are colored so deeply by His love and sincerity to Him, that Almighty God is always on their side and His wrath is upon those who stand against them and wish to cut them off. It was thus that Balaam was destroyed. He had the vanity to think that Moses was not better than he. But the close connection which Moses had with Almighty God cannot be adequately described in words, and this was what the unfortunate Balaam failed to see. He came in opposition to him and was destroyed, nor did his virtue benefit him in any way. Thus it always happens. The deep and close connection which the beloved of God and His chosen and faithful servants have with Him, is not seen by the blind world. Those who have a formal piety and whose hearts are devoid of the true love of God, stand up against the person who has been chosen and sent by God, but it is really God that they are fighting with. It is impossible that Almighty God should destroy him whom he has sent to bring about a great transformation in the world for the sake of a few ignorant men whose piety is imperfect. If the collision of two boats be inevitable, one of which contains a just monarch with his counsellers, while the other has a number of men from the lowest classes of society, it is evident that the latter boat will be drowned to save the former, and the destruction of a few men when such valuable lives are saved will be a matter of rejoicing, not one of regret. Such is the Divine law with respect to those whom God sends as His representatives upon earth to bring men to the right path. Those who stand against them however virtuous they may regard themselves are brought to naught, because otherwise the object of God in sending His apostles would altogether fail. If He were not to protect them and destroy their enemies, no true worshipper of God would be left upon earth. The world looks at the majority and thinks the greater number to be in the right, but God does not look at numbers and appearances but at hearts. The light of the love of God and of true sincerity and faithfulness to Him which is visible in the elect of God,

is such that I would have described it in words if I could. But since the world began, no prophet of God has been able to describe this secret. The soul of His faithful servants falls down on the Divine threshold with a submissiveness which cannot be expressed in words.

After promising a safety for me Almighty God says in the revelation quoted above: "But two sheep," *i.e.*, two of my followers, "will be slaughtered," *i.e.*, killed blameless, "and everything that exists upon earth will ultimately pass away." In the sacred books, meek and innocent men are represented by sheep and sometimes by cows. In this prophecy Almighty God has not used the words that two of my followers would be martyrs, but has figuratively expressed the same idea in beautiful language by speaking of the slaughter of two sheep. In the sheep we find two great uses; we get from it milk to drink and flesh to eat. This prophecy relates to the martyrdom of Maulvi Abdul Latif and his disciple Abdul Rahman, and it has been fulfilled 23 years after its publication in the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya. Maulvi Abdul Latif gave proof of his resemblance with the sheep in its two benefits. In the controversy which took place at Kabul, he gave to his opponents the milk of excellent truths and great verities, though it was rejected by them. Again with the sacrifice of his life, he gave them his flesh and blood that they might eat the one and drink the other in love for him and thus benefit by the sacrifice which he had offered for them. They knew well that they could not thus lay down their lives for the beliefs which they owned and upon which their forefathers died. They could give no instance of any one from among them having ever shown such perseverance and faithfulness. Such a sacrifice was impossible for a man unless filled with certainty he saw the Almighty God who is unseen to the people of this world. Such blood and such flesh as were offered by Maulvi Abdul Latif will ever continue to invite seekers after truth to themselves.

The prophecy relating to these two martyrdoms is followed by words of condolence, for Almighty God knew that their death would be a great shock to this sect. Thus in the revelations that follow the one translated above, Almighty God says: "Be not grieved at this distress and be not sorrowful for what has befallen you (for although you have lost two men yet God is with you, and He will bring to you

many troops for two men) ; for God is sufficient for His servant. Do you not know that God is powerful over everything? And against those who are guilty of this crime, We will produce thee as a witness on the day of judgment, (and We will question them for what sin they killed them.) God shall give thee thy reward, and thy Lord shall be pleased with thee, and shall make thy name, *i.e.*, Ahmad, perfect." This revelation signifies that Ahmad means one who praises God greatly and this description can be true of him only upon whom the blessings and gifts of God are greatly bestowed. The name Ahmad will, therefore, be made perfect when the blessings of God are bestowed in abundance upon the holder of that name. "Do not be grieved at the fate of these two martyrs for Divine wisdom has ordained it, for there are many things which you desire but their attainment is injurious to you, and there are many things to which you are averse though they are good for you ; and God knows what is for your benefit but you know it not."

In these revelations Almighty God gives us to understand that though even a mention of the cruelty with which Maulvi Abdul Latif was killed, is sufficient to make one's heir stand on end and greater injustice than this has hardly been ever done, yet his martyrdom will bring about numerous blessings, and Kabul will see the fruit that it will bear. God remained silent on the murder of Abdul Rahman but He will not be silent now and serious consequences will issue. It is remarkable that when Maulvi Abdul Latif was stoned to death, serious cholera broke out in Kabul and some of the Amir's high officials and the wife and a son of Nasrulla Khan, who took the foremost part in bringing about the death of Maulvi Abdul Latif, fell victims to the epidemic. But this is not all. The cruelty with which Abdul Latif has been killed, awaits yet a greater punishment. There is no instance in this age of such innocent blood spilt in this cruel manner, and woe to the man who has done it, for he has called destruction upon his head. Bear witness, Land of Afghanistan, that on thee the cruelest deed has been done. Thou unfortunate Land, thou art fallen from thy Lord's eyes, for the greatest injustice has been done upon thee.

A recent revelation regarding the murder of Maulvi Abdul Latif will be found in the February number of the Review of Religions under the date February 9th when he was here. It runs thus

قتل خيبة وزيد هيبة i. e, "Murdered in disappointment and his death was awful." Both parts of this revelation are wonderfully true of the murder of Maulvi Abdul Latif, because no one listened to his words and, therefore, he met disappointment, and the people were awed at his death on account of his extraordinary perseverance and of the signs which appeared at his death, one of which was a severe outbreak of cholera.

Another circumstance is worth mentioning before closing this account of the martyrdom of Maulvi Abdul Latif. I had determined to finish it up to the 16th October 1903, for on that date I had to leave Qadian for Gurdaspur to appear in the court in a defamation case instituted against me, and I intended to take the book with me for distribution there. When I began to write it, I was suddenly taken ill with a serious kidney disease. As the date of my appearance in the case was very near, I thought I would not be able to complete this account in time. When the attack became very serious, I prayed to Almighty God. This was at about 3 o'clock after midnight. The object of my prayer was that Almighty God might enable me to finish this account of the martyrdom of one who laid down his life in the cause of God, as proposed by me at first. While thus praying slumber fell upon me and the Word of God came to me سلام قولا من رب رحيم "Peace and security, such is the Word of a Merciful Lord." Within three hours of receiving this revelation, I became perfectly well, and after this I finished the book in time. This sign was shown for the sake of Maulvi Abdul Latif, for he sacrificed his life in the way of God.

A few words of Advice to my Followers.

My followers, may the Almighty God be with you. May He prepare you for your pilgrimage to the next world as He prepared the companions of the Holy Prophet. The desires of this world are all vain. Cursed is the man whose life is given up solely to the world and woe to him who is all in all taken up with its anxieties. Such a one in vain calls himself my follower; he is like the dry branch that will bear no fruit and will, therefore, be cut off. But be ye of

those who are blessed because they enter with all their heart into the spirit of my teaching and are saved. Look upon your God as One, and do not ascribe to Him any partner, either in heaven or in earth. You are not forbidden to make use of means, but he who forsakes God and trusts to his means solely, sets up others with Him in whom should be all your trust. Almighty God has been saying of old by the mouth of His prophets that none will be saved except the pure in heart. Purify yourselves therefore, and purge your hearts of spite and hatred which is not for God. The disobedient spirit is full of impurities but the worst of all is vanity, for it is the root from which infidelity springs. Sympathise with your fellow-beings whom you invite to a heavenly life, for how can your invitation be true if you do them evil in this transitory life. Obey all orders of your God with fear of heart, for you will be questioned as to them. Let your prayers be full of humble supplications to God that He may draw you to Himself and purify your hearts. Man is a weak creature and he cannot get rid of evil except with Divine help. He has not the power to free himself from the bondage of sin except power be granted to him from heaven. The utterance of a few words or a formal subscription to the faith, does not make you a true Muslim. Islam requires you to bow down in complete submission to the Divine will and to prostrate yourselves at the Divine threshold, so as to give a preference to God and His commandments over everything else.

My dear friends ! know it for certain that time has reached its end and a great change has taken place in the world. Do not deceive yourselves with forms and appearances, but be perfect in the righteousness of your hearts. Make the Quran your guide and obtain light from it in every religious matter. But at the same time do not discard the traditions of the Holy Prophet as waste, for they are of great importance and much labour has been spent in their collection. But if a tradition contradicts the Quran, it does not proceed from a pure source and must be thrown away. The Quran has been handed down to you with special Divine protection, therefore value the pure Word of God and give it precedence over everything else, for in this lies righteousness and uprightness of heart.

It should be borne in mind that the efficacy of a preacher's words depends upon the sanctity and Divine knowledge which he is known

to possess. Now Almighty God has furnished thousands of arguments for the truth of my claim so that all men may know that the person who invites them to the path of righteousness, possesses the highest Divine knowledge. As to my righteousness, there is none who can lay any blame to my charge or accuse me of fabrication, lying or cheating during my former life. Had my conduct been impeachable in the past, there would have been some ground to assert that I was an impostor in my present claim. But there is none who can assert that my former life was in any way blamable. It is the grace of God that He gave me the power to walk in righteousness from my early days, and for him who thinks there is a shining argument in this. As to my claim, full light has been thrown on every side of it. All sorts of arguments necessary for establishing the truth of my claim have been manifested by God. Signs have appeared for me upon heaven as well as on earth. All the prophets from the beginning gave the glad tidings of my advent and all those prophecies have been fulfilled in my person. It is impossible that these manifold arguments should have been manifested for an impostor. Nay, the scriptures bear a clear testimony that the impostor is soon cut off and disgrace is brought upon his head and he is destroyed from the face of the earth. But my claim of having been sent by God has been published for more than twenty-three years as is clear from the first part of the Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya. Are these the ways of God, or has it ever occurred, that He should not bring down His wrath upon the impudent and wicked impostor who appears with a new revelation every morning which he calls the Word of God whereas it is all his own fabrication, and continues these arrogant assertions for the long period of 23 years ? Nay, is it possible that instead of destroying such an arrogant blasphemer, God should bestow on him His assistance which He gives to the righteous and show signs and fulfil prophecies for him. Can any one point out any false claimant to Messiahship before me for whom any such wonderful prophecy was fulfilled as that relating to the eclipse of the sun and the moon related in the Holy Quran and authentic traditions, or who was raised in the beginning of the century which according to trustworthy traditions is the time of the appearance of a true reformer, or who was raised with a claim to break the cross when it was in the zenith of its power, or who was assisted by God in every step, or who showed hundreds of thousands of heavenly signs, or who was given honor and

acceptance like me on the face of the earth, or who had hundreds of prophecies fulfilled for him, or who appeared at the appointed hour as foretold by all the prophets, or whose prayers were accepted in the same manner as mine are, or whose words had the efficacy to draw men out of evil, and that Almighty God favored him with all these blessings notwithstanding his persistent imposture during a long period?

It is a most certain fact that the promise which had been given of old by the prophets of God, has now been fulfilled. It is the final struggle between the messenger of God and the arch-fiend. This is the time and hour which was foretold by Daniel. I came as a grace of God for the seekers after truth but I was laughed at. Base appellations were hurled at me and I was called a heretic and the anti-christ and I was numbered with the wicked. But it was necessary that all this should have happened so that the prophecy contained in the last verse of the *Fatiha* should have been fulfilled. It was necessary that the religious leaders of the people should have denied me and thus acquired a resemblance with the Jewish priests. The whole blame of my rejection by the Muslims is upon the shoulders of their leaders who have led them astray. Not only are they themselves falling away from the path of righteousness, but they are also diverting the ignorant people from it. What machinations and artful means are they devising against me, but will they overcome God? Can they prevent the Almighty from accomplishing His object made known to the world by the mouth of His prophets? They themselves and all those whom they trust are but worms in the eye of God.

Let the whole world bear witness that I prophecy in the name of the Lord of earth and heaven that He will spread my followers in all countries and make them overcome every other people by reasons and arguments. The days are approaching and are very near when the religion preached by me, will be the only religion that will be regarded with honor upon the face of the earth. Almighty God will bless this religion and this system in a wonderful manner, and will bring to naught every one who thinks of destroying it. The victory which it will gain will be a lasting victory and its supremacy will continue to the end of days. It matters little if I am scorned now, for there is no prophet who was not laughed at.

It was necessary that the Promised Messiah should have been laughed at, for says the Holy Quran: يا حسرة على العباد ما يأتيهم من رسول الا كانوا به يستهزءون "Alas for the people, no apostle comes to them but they laugh him to scorn." Every one that comes from God ought, therefore, to be laughed at and scorned. But it is impossible that men should laugh at a man who descends from heaven before their eyes and is accompained by hosts of angels. Every sensible person can see from this that the descent of the Messiah from heaven is an absurd and false theory. Bear in mind that no one will ever descend from heaven. All those who oppose me will die, but they will not see the Messiah coming down from heaven. Their children will then pass away without witnessing the descent of the son of Mary. The children of their children will also pass away but they too will not witness such a strange sight. Then the upholders of this theory will be confounded, for the time of the supremacy of the cross will have passed away and the world will have entered a new era, but Jesus will not come down from heaven. All sensible men will then feel an aversion to such a belief. The third century from this day shall not have passed away when all those who look for the descent of Jesus from heaven, whether Christians or Muhammadans, will be despaired of him and will forsake the false belief which is now so fondly cherished. Then will there be one religion in the world and one Leader. I have been sent to sow a seed and I have sown it. It will now grow and bear flowers and fruit in due season. There is none who can uproot it.

My friends, do not grieve for the attacks of those who follow the faith of Swami Daya Nand for the pang is but momentary which is brought about by the venom of their attacks. They are utterly ignorant of the unity of God and utterly devoid of spirituality. They carp at the prophets of God and abuse them, and their great object is to heap up objections with Satanic insinuations, but they have not the spirit which leads to piety and righteousness. But bear in mind that no religion which is devoid of spirituality can prosper; nay, it does not deserve to be called a religion. The religion is dead which has no spirituality, no Divine revelation, no spirit of faithfulness and sincerity and no heavenly magnetism, and which cannot effect a supernatural transformation

in a man's life. Hundreds of thousands of those now living will see with their eyes how it disappears from the face of the earth, for it is earthly and not from heaven, and it speaks of the things of this earth and not of those of heaven. Be happy and exceedingly glad, for God is with you. If you remain firm in your faith and sincerity, the angels will instruct you in heavenly truths and you will feel the Divine presence. Then will you be assisted with the holy spirit and God will be with you in every step that you take, and no one will have the power to vanquish you. Wait patiently for the grace of God. Be silent when you are abused and be patient when you are beaten, and so far as lies in your power forbear the evil that is done to you, so that your names might be written down upon heaven among those that have an acceptance in the sight of God. Know it for certain that God is with those who fear Him, and whose hearts tremble because of the Divine Majesty and awe. The enemies of such men are the enemies of God. The world does not see the righteous but God, who knows every thing, sees His faithful servant and protects him from his enemies with His own hand. Is it not true that if a man loves you sincerely and obeys you and forsakes everything for your sake, you also love him and regard him as your dearest friend? If, being men, you return love for love, will not He, who is your Creator and Master, love you and bestow His favours upon you? God knows well who is His faithful servant and who disloyal to Him and a lover of the world. If you are faithful to Him as He wishes you to be, and are ready to sacrifice all your interests for His sake, then will the Divine hand surely give you an eminent distinction over other people.

The Tomb of Jesus at Sirinagar.

To

THE EDITOR,

"*Review of Religions*,"

QADIAN.

DEAR SIR,

It is a well known fact that the early Christian fathers were so eager to deify the son of Mary that they deemed it a deed of piety

to support his divinity by falsehood and fabrication, and a large number of spurious writings forged by these pious founders of Christianity exist to this day. But this pious practice does not seem to be totally given up by the evangelists even in these days of enlightenment. The discovery of the tomb of Jesus at Srinagar seems to have thrown the Christian Missionaries of India into consternation and some of them have thought it expedient to wield the old and well-tried weapon of their fathers. They have actually resorted to falsehood and deception, and seem to entertain the false hope that by so doing they would be able to obscure the discovery. Rev. Weitbrecht of Lahore has written a letter in the *Epiphany* of June 27th, 1903, in reply to my letter on the tomb of Jesus in your number for May. This gentleman claims to be the writer of the anonymous letter appearing in the *Epiphany* to which I replied in the May number of the *Review of Religions*. He has again appeared with a rejoinder in which he permits himself to make some false statements. His first letter was headed 'The truth about the tomb of Yus Asaf known as Rauza Sahib (*i.e.*, a holy shrine) Srinagar'; but he heads his second letter with the words 'The Srinagar tomb of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din.' This change of name he has made simply to deceive the public. The following statements in his letter are worthy of consideration :—

(*a*). "The men at his tomb stumbled over the name Yus Asaf and pronounced it in different ways, as if it were unfamiliar, and they had recently been visited by the followers of Mirza Sahib, *who doubtless tried to impress it on them.*"

(*b*). "The only name connected with it which the neighbours readily gave us is that of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din. Without, therefore, accepting their testimony as unimpeachable, I have used this as the most probable name of the buried Saint" (*viz.*, Prophet Yus Asaf).

Even if we suppose that the name Yus Asaf was not known to the residents of Srinagar until it was impressed on them by the followers of the Mirza Sahib, that cannot justify him in giving him the name Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din. He intentionally misleads his readers when he says: 'The only name connected with the tomb which the neighbours readily gave us is that of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din.' The 'neighbours never gave Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din as the name of the buried prophet The shrine contains two tombstones, the larger one belonging to Pro-

phet Yus Asaf, and the smaller one to Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din. Rev. Weitbrecht confounds the two names and ascribes the name Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din to the occupant of the larger tomb. He himself wrote in his previous letter: "Within this are two tombstones. He (a venerable old man in charge of the shrine) said that the larger one at the north end was that of prophet Yus Asaf and that the smaller tombstone was that of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din, who had been a *pir* of the place one or two hundred years ago." But in his second letter he forgets what he himself wrote in his first letter. In it he speaks of the tomb again and again as that of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din, hoping that the tomb will thus come to be generally regarded actually as that of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din and that this lie shall pass for a fact. It is for this reason that the words 'The Srinagar tomb of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din' appear as the heading of his second letter. He assumes that the occupant of the tomb was Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din and whenever he has to refer to the tomb in his letter, he calls it the tomb of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din. It is for this reason that we meet with such sentences as the following in his second letter: "The tomb of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din is not generally known as that of prophet Yus Asaf." Notice his adroitness in using the name Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din. This bold and free use of the name for the buried prophet is intended only to impress the name on the readers, as if Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din was indisputably the name of the occupant of the tomb.

He accuses us of acting on the principle 'populus vult decipi ergo decipiatur,' but the truth is that he himself is acting on the principle for it is he who tries to deceive the people by intentionally giving a wrong name to the buried prophet. 'Populus vult decipi ergo decipiatur' has ever been the guiding principle of the Christians. It was by acting on this very principle that the son of Mary was turned into God, and it is again by acting on the same principle that Rev. Weitbrecht has made an attempt to impress the public with the notion that the name of the Srinagar prophet was Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din. But the reverend gentleman must bear in mind that the present generation is far advanced and such principles cannot prevail in these days of enlightenment. If the son of Mary had lived in these days and laid claim to divinity as he is said to have done in the days of Herod, he would have met with the same reception as Mr. Pigott has lately received in London.

Besides his attempt to impress the readers with the notion that the name of the buried prophet was Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din, Mr. Weitbrecht tries to have it believed by the public that the tomb was not known among the people of Srinagar as that of prophet Yus Asaf until the name was impressed on them by the followers of Mirza Sahib. Without the slightest proof in his hand for this daring assertion, he charges Mirza Sahib and his followers with impressing the name Yus Asaf on the people of Srinagar. How did he come to know that the name Yus Asaf was until now unknown to the Kashmiris? The Munshi and others who knew the name Yus Asaf, did not tell him that they had learnt the name from the followers of Mirza Sahib. So this assertion of his is unfounded. He states that the people of Srinagar pronounced the word Yus Asaf stammeringly. But this does not show that the name Yus Asaf was impressed on them by the followers of Mirza Sahib. Yus Asaf being a foreign word, the illiterate Kashmiri finds it very hard to pronounce it and, therefore, he prefers to call the occupant of the tomb by the easier name of *Nabi Sahib*.

In short there is not the slightest evidence for the assertion that the name Yus Asaf was impressed on the inhabitants of Kashmir by Mirza Sahib's followers. We could pardon him for this false and unfounded statement if he had not repeated it in his second letter. But the very fact that he repeats the same assertion in his second letter, renders his conduct unpardonable. It was clearly stated in my first letter that not only oral traditions but also the annals of the country gave Yus Asaf as the name of the buried prophet. I drew his attention to the following words of the learned Editor of the *Al Hilal* (a Christian Magazine issued from Beyrout) :—

"In the Khan Yar street of this city (Srinagar) there is a tomb which the people of Kashmir call the tomb of prophet Yus Asaf. It is visited by people of all classes. *Some of the histories of the country state that this Yus Asaf was a prophet* who came from a distant country. He died and was buried in this city." This then clearly falsified the statement that the name Yus Asaf was impressed on the people of Srinagar by Mirza Sahib's emissaries. But Mr. Weitbrecht ignores the information furnished to him by my letter and continues to stick to his first statement. This circumstance gives us an insight

his motives for the assertion. Notwithstanding his knowledge that his statement was false, inasmuch as the name Yus Asaf was also given in works written long ago, he repeats it again, which he would not have done if his motive had been to find out and make known the truth. If the followers of Mirza Sahib had impressed the name on the people and if it was until now unknown to them, how did it come to pass that the writers of the past ages gave that very word as the name of the prophet lying buried at Srinagar. In order to show that the tomb has ever been known as that of prophet Yus Asaf, and that the name has not been impressed by us on the people, I give here a quotation from Tarikh-i-Aazami (a historical work written about 200 years ago). The writer says on page 82 :— "The tomb next to that of Sayyad Nasr-ud-Din is generally known as that of a prophet. He was a prince who came to Kashmere from a foreign land. He was perfect in his piety, righteousness and devotion. He was made a prophet by God and was engaged in preaching to the Kashmiris. *His name was Yus Asaf.*"

The above passage conclusively shows that the tomb has long been regarded as that of prophet Yus Asaf and that it is not we who have impressed the name on the people. It also falsifies the assertion made by Rev. Weitbrecht that Yus Asaf is not known as a prince.

I give below the translation of a passage from the Ikmal-ud-Din, an Arabic work written about 1,000 years ago. The writer says (page 359) :—

"He (Yus Asaf) wandered about in several lands and towns until he reached a land called Kashmere. So he moved about in the land and lived and stayed therein until death overtook him, and he left his body of clay and ascended to the Light. And before he died, he summoned a disciple of his, named Yabid, who used to serve him and wait on his person and was perfect in all matters, and said to him : 'My departure from this world hath drawn nigh ; so you must perform your duties and not swerve from the truth and observe all rites.' Then he bade the disciple to build him a tomb and stretched out his legs and turned his head to the west and his face to the east and yielded up his ghost."

The following extract from a book entitled 'Barlaam and Josaphat' edited by Joseph Jacobs and published in 1896, supports the

foregoing account. He (Joasaph) at last reaches Kashmir where he puts his head to the west and his feet to the east and dies' (page C V.). Jacobs gives the above account on the authority of a very old version of the story of Yus Asaf.

The writer of the Ikmal-ud-Din relates a very striking incident which establishes once for all that this prince-prophet Yus Asaf, who came to Kashmir from a foreign land, was no other than Yasu or Jesus. The following is a literal translation of his words :—

"At last he (prophet Yus Asaf) reached a vast plain. There he raised his head and saw a large tree growing by the side of a spring of water. The tree was of the most beautiful appearance. It abounded in branches and boughs and bore the most delicious fruits. He was touched with the beauty of the scene and was highly pleased with it, and advanced towards the tree until he reached it. There he began to compare the tree to the *Bushra* (Gospel) which he preached to the people and he likened the spring of water to the wisdom and knowledge which he possessed, and the birds he compared to the people that swarmed round him and accepted his religion."

It is the word *Bushra* in the foregoing passage to which I wish to draw the attention of the reader. It is this word which proves Yus Asaf to be identical with Yasu or Jesus. In the above passage we are told that he preached the *Bushra* to the people. What was that *Bushra?* It was the *Beshora*, *i.e.*, the Gospel or Injil which he preached to the people. It is well-known that *Beshora* is the Hebrew name for Gospel or Injil, all the words meaning 'good tidings.' Now the Hebrew word *Beshora* is the same as *Bushra* in Arabic, both the words signifying 'glad-tidings.' The writer of the Ikmal-ud-Din tells us that Yus Asaf preached the *Bushra* to the people, which means that he preached the Gospel to the people. Who was he then? Certainly he was Jesus and none else. The assumption that he was one of the disciples of Jesus is absurd on the very face of it, for none of his disciples was ever called a prince or a prophet. So the speaker of the above parable was no other than Jesus himself. Just as the tree was full of sap which it received from the spring, so was his Gospel full of the wisdom and knowledge which he possessed, and just as the birds swarmed on the tree and ate of its fruits, so the people flocked round him and received the fruit of salvation by acting on the injunc-

tions contained in the *Bushra* or Gospel.

From the *Ikmal-ud-Din* we not only learn that this Yus Asaf preached Gospel to the people, but the book also records certain parables and teachings which bear a strong resemblance to, and some of them are even identical with, those found in the current Gospels. For instance there is a parable on page 327 of Ikmal-ud-Din' the substance of which is thus given by Joseph Jacobs (page CXI) "When the sower sows his seed, some falls on the highway where the passengers tread it under foot. Others are blown away by the wind. Others picked up by the birds. Some seeds fall on rocky ground and grow only till the roots reach the rock. Others fall among the thistles. Only a small portion falls in rich earth, where it grows and brings forth fruit. The sower is the sage; the seed is his wisdom. The seeds that fall by the wayside, &c., are pieces of wisdom that come into one ear only to go out of the other. Those falling on rocky ground are not taken to heart. Those among thorns meet with opposition from the senses. Only that which takes root in the heart brings forth fruit in the character." The foregoing parable is identical with the parable of the sower in Matt. XIII, 3; Mark, IV, 3; and Luke, VIII, 5.

On the one hand, we find Yus Asaf giving the name *Bushra* or Gospel to the book which was revealed to him by God, and on the other, we find parables and sayings in the story of Yus Asaf which are the same as attributed to Jesus in the Christian Scriptures. These two facts clearly identify Yus Asaf with Jesus.

Rev. Weitbrecht asserts that there is no evidence to prove the identity of Yus Asaf with Josaphat whose story is translated in almost all the languages of Europe. It is indeed strange that gentlemen like Mr. Weitbrecht should make such absurd statements. Is he not aware that the Oriental versions of the story of St. Josaphat contain Yus Asaf instead of Josaphat? What other proof does he require of the identity of Yus Asaf with Josaphat? The same story which is related of St. Josaphat is related of Yus Asaf, which is the most convincing proof that Yus Asaf and Josaphat are one and the same person. Nothing can be plainer than this. If *Yasú'* is identical with Jesus, he must admit that Yus Asaf is identical with Josaphat. How Yus Asaf assumed the form of Josaphat is clear from the following

words of Joseph Jacobs: "Josaphat is only the Roman spelling for Yosaphat, this again being a confusion between the Biblical Jehosaphat and the Greek form Joasaph. This is directly derived from the Arabic; it is a contracted form of Yudasaph," (page XLVI). It must be remembered here that the original form is not Yudasaph, but Yus Asaph, as may be seen in the Arabic versions which still exist and from one of which I have already quoted.

Rev. Weitbrecht states that St. Josaphat is identical with Bodhisatva, which is one of the titles of Buddha, and that, therefore, if we suppose Yus Asaf to be identical with Josaphat, then Yus Asaf was not Jesus, but Gautama Buddha. I know that attempts have been made to identify Joasaph or Yus Asaph with Gautama Buddha, and if the tomb of Yus Asaf had not been discovered, this theory might have passed uncontradicted. But now that the tomb of St. Josaphat has been discovered, it is foolish to stick any longer to the theory of the identity of Josaphat with Gautama Buddha. Those who formulated the theory (Max Muller and others) did not know that the person whom they identified with Buddha lay buried in the Khan Yar Street of Srinagar. The remains of Buddha have been only recently discovered, and no sane person would take the occupant of the Srinagar tomb for Gautama Buddha. The fact that it is Yus Asaf that lies buried in the Srinagar tomb cannot be denied. Tradition calls it the tomb of prophet Yus Asaf. The annals of the country state that the tomb is that of prophet Yus Asaf, a prince and foreigner who came to this land long centuries ago. Works that were written more than 1,000 years ago state that prince Yus Asaf died and was buried in Kashmir. In the face of these facts, it is simply ridiculous to identify Yus Asaf with Gautama. Those who first propounded the theory of the identification of Yus Asaf with Buddha were ignorant of the facts stated above.

Besides, Max Muller and others who originated the theory were no inspired writers. They were not infallible. The Christian world believes that even the writers of the Bible were not infallible and that they have actually committed grave errors. If, then, even the writers of the Old and the New Testament could commit error, how was it possible for persons like Max Muller to escape error?

The mere similarity of incidents in the lives of the two great

teachers is not a sufficient ground for the identification of the one with the other. Jesus too, like Gautama, might have received the title of Buddha, for Buddha (the wise) is not the proper name of Gautama. There have been many Buddhas both before and after Gautama, and Jesus might have also been included in the list of the Buddhas by the Indians on his arrrival in Kashmir. This might have led the writers of the life of Yus Asaf to confound Jesus Buddha with Gautama Buddha, and certain incidents of the life of the latter might have been inserted by them in the life of the former. The very name Yus Asaf shows that it is not identical with Bodhisatva. There is not the slightest similarily between the two names. All attempts to show that Yus Asaf is only another form of Bodhisatva are fruitless. On the other hand, if we are to base identification on the similarity of names, the odds lie on the side of Yus Asaf's identity with Jesus. Yus Asaf is evidently a compound word, the component parts of which are *Yus* and *Asaf*. *Yus* is obviously *Yasu'*, the Hebrew name of Jesus. *Asaf* too is a Hebrew word and it means the assembler of the people. Jesus very aptly chose the name *Asaf* when he left his native land in quest of the lost sheep of Israel that had scattered over Afghanistan and Kashmir. Thus we see that Yus Asaf is but a shortened form of Yasu Asaf (Jesus, the assembler of the lost tribes). That Yus Asaf is a contraction of Yasu Asaf is far more reasonable than the supposition that Yus Asaf is a corruption of Bodhisatva.

Moreover, the remains of Gautama have been discovered in another place while in the case of Jesus we know that he left the sepulchre in which he was placed and was seen moving about and partaking of food after the event of crucifixion. This also leads us to conclude that this Yus Asaf was Yasu Asaf and not Gautama. This conclusion is further borne out by the testimony of tradition and history that Yus Asaf was a prince and prophet who came from a distant land hundreds of years ago. The fact that the Afghans and Kashmiris are the representatives of the lost tribes of Israel, further supports the view that Yus Asaf is Jesus, the assembler of the lost tribes, and not Gautama. It was natural for Jesus, nay it was his bounden duty to turn his steps to the abode of the lost tribes after he had recovered from the swoon into which he had fallen owing to a few hours' suspension on the cross—a duration of time admittedly insufficient to bring about death. In short, there is a very strong

evidence to show that Yus Asaf was Jesus, the assembler, and not Gautama as Rev. Weitbrecht asserts.

Rev. Weitbrecht remarks in the *Epiphany* that he would not insult the intelligence of the readers by entering into the wild statements made by the *Review of Religions* in order to cast doubts on the death of Jesus on the cross as a historical fact. It is indeed strange to see a Christian appealing to the intelligence of the readers. Is it not an insult to human intelligence, I would ask the Rev. gentleman, to believe that the Infinite God contracted Himself into an embryo and managed to enter into the womb of Mary? Is it not, again, an insult to human intelligence to believe that the child that lay wrapped in its swaddling clothes in the manger at Bethlehem was the Creator of heavens and earth? Is it not again an insult to human intelligence to believe that the poor creature that was beaten and maltreated, and at last crucified by the Jews was the Almighty God that brought everything into existence? The fact is that Mr. Weitbrecht finds himself unable to refute the arguments which show that Jesus did not die on the cross and, therefore, contents himself with styling the arguments as wild statements and calling the death of Jesus on the cross a historical fact. All the facts related in the Gospels show that Jesus did not die on the cross, but our intelligent Missionary still calls the accursed death of Jesus a historical fact. Jesus' likening his case to that of Jonas, who went into the whale's belly *alive* and came out of it *alive*, the taking down of his body after only a few hours' suspension on the cross, the issuing of the blood from his side, his bones being left unbroken, his leaving the sepulchre shortly after he was placed therein, his subsequent journey to Galilee, his partaking of food, showing the wounds on his limbs to his disciples and causing one of them to pass his fingers into the prints of the nails—all these facts related in the Gospels prove that Jesus escaped the accursed death of the cross, but still would Rev. Weitbrecht call his death on the cross a historical fact. A very strong evidence of Jesus' escape from the accursed death of the cross is furnished by the Ointment of Jesus or the Ointment of the Apostles. A large number of medical works state that the Ointment was applied to the wounds of Jesus by his apostles. Our intelligent friend would reject this evidence also. But he would not tell us on what ground he rejects it. All he has to say about the ointment is that it is

"still retailed by a disciple of the Qadian Mirza as well as recommended in a former number of the *Review of Religions*." But does that show that the ointment was not applied to the wounds of Jesus by his disciples? Would he say in this case also that the name of 'the Ointment of Jesus' was not known to the authorities on medicine, until it was impressed on them by the disciples of 'the Qadian Mirza.'

Here I bid adieu to Rev. Weitbrecht.

Yours truly,
SHER ALI.

Monro on Sinlessness-Continued.

Mr. Monro very boldly charges the Promised Messiah with impudence, impiety, displaying ignorance, deceiving people deliberately, &c., in his second pamphlet on the Sinlessness of prophets. Perhaps he was acting upon the Gospel text which recommends the use of of polite words, (whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire), and these are outbursts of his evangelical virtue. Had he received any personal provocation from the Promised Messiah, he could have claimed a justification in uttering such abuses, but the Messiah never referred to him in the articles contributed by him. Passing over it for the present, we notice an assertion of Mr. Monro on the very first page of his pamphlet which so far as we have seen and read the Holy Quran, is not warranted by any passage of the Holy Book. He says: "The various passages in the Quran, referred to, will be found in a previous tract . . . . . To do away with the force of these passages, in which the sinfulness of Muhammad and the prophets (with the exception of Jesus Christ) is proved to demonstration . . . . . ." Can Mr. Monro point out a single passage of the Holy Quran in which Jesus is made an exception to the other prophets in respect of sinfulness? He plainly speaks of passages of the Holy Quran in which the sinfulness of prophets with the exception of Jesus Christ is proved to demonstration, and as a gentleman he is bound to quote some of these passages. He quotes the verse ما محمد الا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل to show that the Holy Prophet is like the other prophets in all points and that he cannot be an exception to them if they are sinful, and himself translates it thus: "Muhammad is

no more than an apostle—the other apostles have deceased before him." But he forgets to note the identical verse speaking of Jesus : ما المسيح ابن مريم الا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل which differs from the Previous verse only in having المسيح ابن مريم (the Christ, son of Mary) substituted for محمد (Muhammad), and according to Mr. Monro it would be translated thus: "Christ, son of Mary, is no more than an apostle—the other apostles have deceased before him." How is Jesus an exception then? He is in no respect different from the prophets who preceded him just as the Holy Prophet is not. It may be further noted that Jesus died like the other prophets, and this is plainly told in both the verses quoted above. In the first verse he is included among the prophets who have " deceased " before the Holy Prophet, and in the second he is spoken of as being in no way different from the other prophets who died before him.

To undeceive Mr. Monro of any delusion to which he may be subject, it is further necessary to warn him that since but a very few prophets have been named in the Holy Quran, therefore, to establish the sinfulness of all the prophets with the exception of Jesus Christ, it will be his duty to produce any general statement from the Holy Quran leading to the conclusion which he has so audaciously put forward, and further that as he has spoken of the passages of the Quran, no tradition or commentary shall be accepted. In his first pamphlet, Mr. Monro has charged only the following prophets with sins, *viz.*, Adam, Moses, Aaron, David, Abraham, Jonas, Noah, and our Holy Prophet. Can he point out any passage of the Holy Quran relating any sinful deed of John, whose disciple Jesus was, or of Shuaib, or Isaac, or Ishmael, or Zacharias, or Elias, or many other prophets ? Or, are all these prophets exceptions like Jesus ? Again the Holy Quran says plainly that it has named but a few of the prophets. On what authority does Mr. Monro regard the prophets that are not named in the Holy Quran as sinful. His assertion that the Holy Quran contains passages showing that all the prophets with the exception of the son of Mary are sinful, must be condemned if he cannot quote any verse warranting such a general statement.

The fact is that to establish the doctrine of the sinfulness or sinlessness of the prophets, general statements must be produced from the Holy Quran. That the Holy Quran does not contain a

single passage affirming the sinfulness of the prophets generally has been tacitly admitted by Mr. Monro himself for he has been unable to produce any such verse hitherto. On the other hand, certain verses were pointed out to him by a Maulvi in support of the doctrine of sinlessness, but to these Mr. Monro objected on the ground that there were passages in the Holy Quran which, he alleged, spoke of the sins of certain prophets. We have fully discussed all these passages in the July and August numbers of this magazine and Mr. Monro has not been able to point out any mistake in their interpretation. Two points are, therefore, now settled: (1) that the Holy Quran does not contain any general statement affirming the sinfulness of prophets; and (2) that no sinful deed is ascribed to any prophet in the Holy Quran.

We will now see if there are any verses in the Holy Quran supporting the doctrine of the sinlessness of the prophets. Reference has already been made in discussing the meaning of *istighfar* to the verse which occurs in the chapter, entitled "the Prophets," showing that whatever the prophets say or do is said or done with the sanction of the Divine Being. Thus it says: وما ارسلنا من قبلك من رسول الا نوحي اليه انه لا اله الا انا فاعبدون ۰ وقالوا اتخذ الرحمن ولدا سبحنه بل عباد مكرمون لا يسبقونه بالقول وهم بامره يعملون يعلم ما بين ايديهم وما خلفهم ولا يشفعون الا لمن ارتضى وهم من خشيته مشفقون "And no apostle have We sent before thee to whom We did not reveal that there is no God besides Me, therefore, worship Me. Yet they say that the God of mercy has begotten a son. Glory be to God, the apostles are but His honoured servants; *they speak not till He has spoken, and at His bidding do they act.* He knoweth what is before them and what is behind them; and they shall not intercede but for him with whom He is pleased, and they are in fear because of the fear of God." We have quoted the particular verse whose translation has been italicised with the preceding and the subsequent verses to show that none but prophets are spoken of in these verses. Here of the prophets of God it is stated that they utter no word until God commands them to utter it and do no deed until God commands them to do it. In fact Almighty God identifies the words and deeds of the prophets with His own words and deeds. What stronger proof than this is needed to establish the sinlessness of the prophets? The words which

are here used of the prophets are identical in their signification with the words spoken of the angels elsewhere which run thus: يخافون ربهم من فوقهم ويفعلون ما يومرون "They fear their Lord from above and do what they are bidden to do." Now it is admitted on all hands that the angels are sinless, and their description, as given in the Holy Quran, agrees with the description of the prophets. Hence we have in the verse quoted above the plainest proof of the sinlessness of the prophets.

Many other verses of the Holy Quran lead to the same conclusion. In the chapter entitled *Fatir* in the 29th verse, the inheritors of the Book, *i.e.*, the believers in God, have been divided into three classes; *viz.*, (1) those who injure themselves by evil deeds; (2), those who keep the mean, and (3), those who practise the highest virtues The believers of the first class have their virtuous deeds mixed with evil deeds; those of the second practise ordinary virtues but they are not altogether out of the reach of evil, and are liable to stumble though the evil tendency is soon overcome and it does not do them any injury; and the believers of the third class are altogether out of the power of evil and excel in virtues of the highest order.

That there is a class of true believers in God who are out of the reach of evil is corroborated by other verses of the Holy Quran. When condemned to everlasting punishment, Satan said: فبعزتك لاغوينهم اجمعين الا عبادك منهم المخلصين "I swear by Thy honour that I will lead them all astray except Thy chosen servants," thus indicating that there is a class of the faithful servants of God over whom he has no power and whom he cannot divert from the right path. Similarly, Almighty God says: ان عبادي ليس لك عليهم سلطان *i.e.*, Satan cannot have any power over the servants of God. Here the word عباد which is the plural of عبد does not denote the whole mankind, but only the faithful and chosen servants of God, such as the prophets are. In both these verses it is plainly stated that Satan has no power over the faithful servants of God; in other words, they are free from every evil, and can never be guilty of a sinful deed.

Again, it cannot be denied that the duty of a prophet is to that which is right and to prohibit that which is wrong.

Now if he himself acts against his own injunctions, he would be one of those whom the Holy Quran reproaches by the mouth of the Prophet in the following words: اتامرون الناس بالبر وتنسون انفسكم "Do you enjoin what is right upon others and forget your ownsouls?" These words have been spoken in the Holy Quran of the Jewish priests who denied and rejected the prophets. They thought that they did not stand in need of any prophet as they had the Word of God with them which they preached to the laity. But Almighty God condemns them for doing that which they forbade others to do, and tells them to follow the prophet if they wished to be saved. If the prophets were sinful, they would apparently fall under the description given here of the Jewish priests, and it would be absurd to require the latter to follow them, both being on the same ground. The priests taught the word of virtue but they did not act upon it, and if the prophets did the same, there was no need of sending them while there was an abundance of the priests. But the fact is that no amount of preaching unattended with example can draw men out of evil, and hence the need of prophets who act upon what they teach and thus set an example of virtue.

That no one is made a prophet who is guilty of evil deeds, also appears from the following verse. واذ ابتلى ابراهيم ربه بكلمت فاتمهن قال انى جاعلك للناس اماما قال ومن ذريتى قال لاينال عهدى الظلمين In this verse Almighty God first speaks of certain commandments given to Abraham which he all fulfilled. Pleased with his righteousness He then promised him a spiritual leadership of the people, *i.e.*, prophethood. Upon this Abraham prayed to God that prophets should also be raised from his offspring, and received the answer that of his children only such would be made prophets as did not do any evil and that this command did not embrace the evil-doers. This verse shows conclusively that a sinful man is never made a prophet by God. It first speaks of prophethood being granted to Abraham because he did not disobey any Divine commandment and then informs him plainly that though on account of his great righteousness prophets would be raised of his offspring, yet no one who did an evil deed would be elected as a prophet. Two conclusions are undeniable; (1), that Almighty God does not ever make an evil-doer or a sinful man a prophet, and (2), that all the descendants of Abraham who were made prophets,

were sinless men. Is it not folly to ascribe sinfulness to the prophets of God notwithstanding such plain words?

Again in *Sura* An'ám, Almighty God says, naming various prophets: ووهبنا له اسحاق ويعقوب كلا هدينا ونوحا هدينا من قبل ومن ذريته داود وسليمن وايوب ويوسف وموسى وهرون وكذالك نجزى المحسنين وزكريا ويحيى وعيسى والياس كل من الصلحين واسمعيل واليسع ويونس ولوطا وكلا فضلنا على العلمين "And we gave to him (*i. e.*, Abraham) Isaac and Jacob; We directed them both; and Noah had We directed before; and of his posterity David and Solomon, and Job and Joseph and Moses and Aaron; thus do We reward the righteous. And Zacharias and John and Jesus and Elias, all of them were upright men: and Ishmael and Elisha and Jonas and Lot to all these have We given excellence above the rest of the world." Reading this verse along with that quoted above, it is clear that all these prophets, who are spoken of as being directed in the right way, were made prophets in accordance with the promise given to Abraham which did not extend to the evil-doers.

These are only a few of the verses establishing the sinlessness of the prophets. The Holy Quran teems with such verses, but it is not necessary to quote them all here as those quoted above establish conclusively that sin cannot be ascribed to prophets. It has been shown that the words and deeds of the prophets are all in obedience to the Divine commandments, that they are men who excel in virtues of the highest order and whose virtues are not mixed with evil, that Satan has no power over them, that they preach virtue to others and themselves act upon what they say, that no evil-doer or sinful man can be made a prophet, and that they were all directed by Almighty God in the right path from which they never swerved.

So far as the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, is concerned, he has the distinction of sinlessness pre-eminently, and this is seen from various considerations. In the first place he is described as the most excellent of all prophets and the greatest of them and, therefore, in his purity and sinlessness he must excel all other prophets; secondly, his sinlessness is not only established because he is one of the prophets,

who are described to be sinless, but it is also clearly affirmed in particular in many verses. On one occasion the Holy Quran says: ومن يعص الله ورسوله فان له نار جهنم خالدا فيها "Whoever will disobey God and His Prophet, his punishment is hell." Here obedience to God and obedience to His Apostle are mentioned in the same breath, showing that every word uttered by the Prophet and every deed done by him, was uttered or done with Divine sanction, for otherwise obedience to him could not have been made compulsory along with obedience to God. Elsewhere we read ومن يطع الرسول فقد اطاع الله "Whoso obeys the Apostle obeys God;" in other words, the will of the Apostle is the will of God. For, if the Prophet willed a thing which Almighty God did not will, obedience to him could not have been obedience to God. It is clear from these two verses that the Prophet's will could not go against the Divine will and, therefore, he could not commit a sin, for sin involves a disobedience to the will of God. We may also add that several verses such as قل ان صلوتي ونسكي ومحياي ومماتي لله and رب العالمين and ان الذين يبايعونك انما يبايعون الله يد الله فوق and ما ضل صاحبكم وما and وما رميت اذ رميت ولكن الله رمى and ايديهم and ما ينطق عن الهوى have been fully discussed in a previous issue, and it has been shown that they are all conclusive arguments of the sinlessness of our Holy Prophet. Similarly the verse قل ان كنتم تحبون الله فاتبعوني يحببكم الله ويغفر لكم ذنوبكم "Say if you love God, then walk in my footsteps: then will God love you and pardon your sins," has been discussed at full length in the same issue. This verse also clearly shows that the Holy Prophet could not have sinned, for otherwise God could not have been pleased with a man, nor could his sins have been pardoned, by walking in the footsteps, of one who sometimes offended God by disobeying His orders. An honest student of the Holy Quran cannot doubt for a moment that the person described in all these verses was above sin.

Besides those verses which need not be discussed here, there are numerous other verses in the Holy Quran in which the sinlessness of our Holy Prophet is plainly spoken of. Thus in one place the Holy Prophet is described as an exemplar of virtue and all men are commanded to imitate him and walk in his footsteps. Had the

Holy Prophet's step ever fallen on a forbidden place, his imitation would not have been required thus unconditionally. The Quran was free from error and a sufficient guide. Why was the Holy Prophet then pointed out for imitation if he was not free from error? Again it is said: "Verily, God and His angels bless the Prophet; bless ye him, O believers." Here the believers are required to invoke the Divine blessings on the Holy Prophet, and any one who described him as sinful would be going against the Divine injunction. Thus the behest of God to bless the Holy Prophet is consistent only with his sinlessness. This is further made clear in the very next verse where it is said ان الذين يؤذون الله ورسوله لعنهم الله "Verily, they who affront God and His Apostle, the curse of God is on them." And still further: ان الذين يؤذون المومنين والمومنات بغير ما اكتسبوا فقد احتملوا بهتانا واثما مبينا "And they who shall affront believing men and believing women for no fault of theirs, shall surely bear the guilt of slander and of a clear wrong." The difference in the two verses should be marked. In the first verse the curse of God is invoked on him who affronts God and His Apostle; while in the second, it is stated that the person who affronts the believers *without any fault on their part*, is guilty of slander. The italicised words are not found in the first verse. This omission clearly shows that the possibility of fault which exists in the case of believers, and which renders the insertion of the phrase "without any fault on their part" necessary, does not exist in the case of the Prophet. This is also evident from the fact that God and His Apostle are spoken of in the same breath, and therefore as no fault can be ascribed to God, so it is in the case of the Prophet Moreover the affronting of the Prophet is described as a sin here, and it cannot be doubted that the person who lays any blame to the charge of the Prophet or calls him sinful, affronts the Prophet. To attribute any sin to the Prophet is, therefore, a grave sin condemned in plain words by the Holy Quran. The affronter of the Prophet by attributing any sin to him is cursed while the true believers are enjoined to invoke the blessings of God on him. Does Mr. Monro still seriously entertain any doubt as to the sinlessness of the Holy Prophet?

So unsullied is the purity of the Prophet's life that his con-

temporaries could not point out any fault in the whole course of his life when challenged to do so. "I have dwelt among you for so many years, do you not then understand," said the Holy Prophet to those who called him an impostor. They were told to think how he led forty years of his life among them and consider if a man of his character could be an impostor. Such a serious charge as imposture was not consistent with a spotless purity and a life free from every imputation of blame: such is the argument to which the Holy Quran calls attention in the above words. In this respect the Holy Prophet has a unique eminence. He called as a witness to his truth the early course of his life about which his opponents had no two opinions. A man who in the prime of his manhood offended neither God nor man, would not in his old days do anything to sully his good reputation. The force of this argument would become clearer to Mr. Monro if he compares the early life of Jesus (*i. e.*, before he was charged with a heavenly mission) with that of our Holy Prophet. The first 30 years of Jesus' life are in obscurity, and not only did he himself refrain from making any reference to them, but the evangelists are also silent on this point. If we go to the Jewish writers, for whom great accuracy and truth are claimed by the Christians, we find stories recorded of him (such as the story of his love) which throw descredit upon his character at that period. Had here it not been for the Holy Quran, it would have been difficult to establish his sinlessness from the events recorded of him. But the early life of the Holy Prophet is fully detailed in traditions and during forty years not one event is recorded of him which might throw the slightest slur on his character. So pure and free from every blame was his whole life that he was generally known as "Al-Amin" (the faithful one.) The Holy Quran has also pithily described the unsullied purity of that portion in the verse quoted above, and has used it as an argument for the truth of his claim which it could not do if it were not undisputed.

The English Press on the Promised Messiah.

False Prophets Denounced and Challenged.

Within the past few weeks there has been issued from Qadian, in the Punjab, a Notice "for circulation in Europe and America," entitled "Predictions Concerning Pigott and Dowie. By the Promised Messiah." This remarkable document, which forms a six-page pamphlet, has been printed at Lahore in the English language, but the Promised Messiah is apparently a native of Asia, since the pamphlet includes a Translator's Note, and the signature appended to the Predictions is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

The "Delusion" of Christianity.

It may be of interest to indicate, briefly and without comment, the contents of the Notice. There is no ambiguity about the statement of the claim put forward. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad categorically affirms—"I am the true Messiah who was to come in the last ages." But his idea of the nature of the Messiah differs materially from the orthodox Christian conception. "It is impossible," he declares, "that a man should ever become God, but he can attain to the highest degree of connection with Him, and is thus made an image of the Divine Being. . . . . He sometimes manifests the Divine attributes, for the image of God is revealed in the looking-glass of his person, and again he displays human qualities, for he has a human nature. It is for this reason that men who have not got a deep insight into spiritual matters are deceived with respect to him by looking at one side only, and ignoring the other. Finding in him certain manifestations of the Divine attributes they take the shadow for the substance, and suppose such a person to be actually God. . . . . The delusion under which labours the Christian sect, which takes Jesus for God, is stronger than the delusion of all other people who have ever been the dupes of similar errors;" and what Mirza Ghulam Ahmad finds particularly disappointing in connection with the Christian religion is that when "the false dogma" is found to be "unacceptable to the growing intellect of the age, new methods are devised to renew a belief in the absurd theory and new false claims are set up to uphold old ones."

Dr. Dowie and Mr. Pigott.

As might be expected from the title of the pamphlet, the claims that call for the strongest condemnation from Mirza Ghulam Ahmad are those put forward by Dr. Dowie and Mr. Pigott. "In Europe, Mr. Pigott . . . lays claim to Messiahship and Divinity, and plainly declares himself to be Lord of Earth and Heavens, while in the Western Hemisphere stands up Dr. Dowie at Chicago and asserts that he is Elijah, the forerunner of Jesus Christ, whose advent, he foretells, will take place within the next 25 years. The two pretenders show a slight difference in the boldness of their assumptions. The Scotch pretender shows a faint heart. He claims at the most the office of a servant preparing the way for the master (Christ),

but he shows cowardliness even in claiming Elijahship. Mr. Pigott is bolder than Dowie ; that is to say, when judged by the arrogance of his pretensions. He is the very Messiah who came before ; nay, he is more—he is God himself ; such are his vain and blasphemous assertions."

"Hundreds of Heavenly Signs."

It is because the earth is defiled with impieties and impure doctrines and false claims, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad declares, that the true Messiah has been raised up in his person in the land of the Punjab. Though he makes no pretence of being himself divine, yet "I do not claim to be the Promised Messiah simply by my own assertion. . . . The evidence of God has been manifested in hundreds of heavenly signs shown in my support. I say it truly that Almighty God has poured His grace upon me in far greater abundance that upon the Messiah who has gone before me. In the looking-glass of my person the face of God is revealed to a far greater extent than in that of Jesus's person. If these are simply my own assertions, and there is no other authority for them, I am a liar ; but if Almighty God bears witness to my truth no one can give the lie to me."

A Challenge.

In particular, the fate of Dr. Dowie and Mr Pigott will furnish a sign of the authority of the new Messiah. From the translator's note we learn that in September of last year a challenge was sent to Dr. Dowie by the Promised Messiah through a monthly periodical published at Qadian, called the "Review of Religions." Dr. Dowie, it seems, had predicted that all Muhammadans would perish because they did not recognise Jesus Christ as God and Dowie as Elijah. The challenge provoked by this statement was in these terms :— " Whether the God of Muhammadans or the God of Dowie is the true God may be settled without the loss of millions of lives which Dr. Dowie's prediction would involve. That method is that without threatening the Muhammadan public in general with destruction, he should choose me as his opponent and pray to God that of us two whosoever is the liar may perish first. . . . In making this proposal I have not taken the initiative but the jealous God has inspired me. . . ."

And a Prophecy.

Openly no notice has been taken of this challenge, but it is alleged that it has not been without result, since in a recent issue of "Leaves of Healing," the organ of his sect, Dr. Dowie condemned Christians for believing in the Trinity and sympathised with Jews and Muhammadans who recognise the Unity of God. In his predictions (dated the 23d of last August), Mirza Ghulam Ahmad states that he will wait seven months longer for a reply to his challenge. If Dr. Dowie accepts the challenge within this period, and fulfils all the conditions, " the world will soon see the end of this contest. I am about 70 years of age, while Dr Dowie is about 55. . . . But since the matter is not to be settled by age, I do not care for this

great disparity in years." If Dowie still refuses to take up the challenge, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad declares that the pretensions of the American prophet will be proved to be an imposture. As to Mr. Piggott, the Promised Messiah prophesies that that "arrogant pretender to Divinity . . . shall be brought to destruction within my life-time."

Bold Assertion.

It is not, perhaps, without interest to note that in the concluding sentence of his note the translator calls attention to an article in the "Review of Religions" for the last month, "showing that Jesus did not die upon the Cross, but that having escaped from it with His life, He subsequently died at Srinagar (Cashmir), where His tomb may still be seen in the Khan Yar Street." *Glasgow Harold.*

ONE cannot be surprised that destructive Biblical criticism is now used as a weapon by Muhammadans and others to enforce their arguments against Christianity. These Christians, they say, who are sending out missionaries to convert us do not themselves believe their own Bible. Some of their leading men, they add, have proved it false, deny its recorded miracles, the divinity of Jesus Christ, His Resurrection, &c. It is evident that missionary work must suffer greately in the more civilised and better-educated countries where heathen teachers can point out that in our own seats of learning there are professors who devote their lives to prove that the Bible is full of error. Not long ago a conference of missionaries was held at Calcutta, and the subject of Higher Criticism was discussed. A report of this was carefully studied by a Muhammadan controversialist, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who, in an article which appears in his magazine, the *Review of Religions*, quotes some of the so-called results of Biblical Criticism, claims the destructive critics as his co-workers against the Bible and Christianity, charges the missionaries with teaching what is known to be error, and holds up the Koron as the only book on the face of the earth which claims to be the true and unmixed Word of God. He proceeds to argue that "the truth of the Higher Criticism and the error of the Bible being recognised, it is difficult to see how the Christian religion can stand for one moment."

THE Mirza brings forward the "Encyclopædia Biblica" as a proof of what he says, and he quotes from the article on the Gospels by the Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Zurich, Paul W. Schmiedel. For in Switzerland, as well as in England, there are men who hold positions and retain emoluments which they could only have secured by professing their faith in the very Word which they now attack. Here we have a professor of New Testament Exegesis who sees very little in the Gospels that can be regarded as credible, who says, after some columns of destructive criticism, that "The foregoing sections may have sometimes seemed to raise a doubt whether any credible elements were to be found in the Gospels at all." Professor Schmiedel finds, however, some few passages which

he thinks may be genuine—some five passages, to which he afterwards adds four. Of course, according to the Professor, none of the miracles are true. The feeding of the 5,000 and the 4,000, the raising of the dead, the cleansing of the lepers, the lame walking, the blind seeing, were not, he tells us, historical circumstances at all, they refer not to the physically, but to the spiritually dead, blind, lame, &c. This is very much like much other matter which can be found in Dr. Cheyne's "Encyclopædia Biblica," and the Mirza quite agrees with it. He calls it to witness to support his contentions, and he welcomes the evidence of these Biblical professors and experts as confirming his own views as a Mohammadan. The Bible the missionaries preach, he tells his co-religionists, is a book of lies; their own professors openly acknowledge it. The Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Zurich, he proceeds, can only find five absolutely credible passages in the Gospels about Jesus, and these he quotes. The Mirza quotes a further passage from Schmiedel to prove that Christians themselves do not believe in Christ's divinity "We have to do," says Professor Schmiedel, "with a completely human being, and the divine is to be sought in Him only in the form in which it is capable of being found in a man." The "Encyclopædia Biblica," is a rich mine of information for men like the Mirza and for all enemies of the Bible and Christianity, and these men are not anxious to give the other side of the question, the scientific refutations of the heresies in which they delight. As we remarked a fortnight ago, such teaching as we have referred to in the "Encyclopædia Biblica" "constitutes the deadliest peril that assails the truth of God at the present day"; the "toleration by the Church of England of such opinions is not only a terrible blot but a potent engine alike of Romanism and of Dissent in discrediting her catholicity and in winning proselytes from her fold." And now, in the light of this Muhammadan experience, we may add that it is proving the greatest obstacle to the spread of Christ's Gospel in heathen lands.—*Church Family Newspaper.*

Dowie Challenged.

Indian Messiah Dares Him to Prove His Claims. . . . .

Dowie has a rival. From faraway India comes a printed circular from Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who writes from Quadian, in the Punjab.

. . . . . .

He has issued a challenge to Elijah III. to make good his pretensions, but so far Zion City's own and especial messiah has failed to reply.

In support of his claims to divinity the Indian Messiah declares that when the Lord saw how badly things were being managed on earth He raised him in the land of the Punjab "for His works are wonderful."

"I am the true Messiah who was to come in the last ages: thus has Almighty God spoken to me," he announces. "I do not claim to be the Promised Messiah simply by my own assertion, but Almighty God who made the earth and heaven has borne witness to the truth of my claim. The evidence of God has been manifested in hundreds of

heavenly signs shown in my support. I say it truly that Almighty God has poured His grace upon me in far greater abundance than upon the Messiah who has gone before me. In the lookingglass of my person the face of God is revealed to a far greater extent than in that of Jesus's person. If these are simply my own assertions, and there is no other authority for them, I am a liar; but if Almighty God bears witness to my truth no one can give the lie to me. Thousands of times—I should say times without number—has He borne witness to the truth of my claim.

"A sign of the evidence of God in my favor will appear on the death of Mr. Pigott, the arrogant pretender to divinity, who shall be brought to destruction within my lifetime. Another sign will appear on Dr. Dowie's acceptance of my challenge. If the pretender of Elijahship shows his willingness by any direct or indirect means to enter the lists against me, he shall leave the world before my eyes with great sorrow and torment. These two signs are particularly for Europe and America: ah! that they ponder over them and benefit by them.

"It should be borne in mind that Dr. Dowie has not given any reply to my challenge sent to him in September last, nor has he even so much as mentioned it in his paper. For an answer to that challenge I will wait for a further period of seven months from this day, the 23rd of August, 1903. If he accepts the challenge within this period and fulfils all its conditions as published by me previously, and makes an announcement to that effect in his paper, the world will soon see the end of this contest. I am about seventy years of age, while Dr. Dowie is about fifty-five, and, therefore, compared with me, he is a young man still. But since the matter is not to be settled by age, I do not care for this great disparity in years. The whole matter rests in the hands of Him who is the Lord of heaven and earth and Judge over all judges, and He will decide it in favor of the true claimant.

"But if Dr. Dowie cannot, even now, gather caurage to appear in the contest against me, let both continents bear witness that I shall be entitled to claim the same victory as in the case of his death in my lifetime if he accepts the challenge. The pretensions of Dr. Dowie will thus be falsified and proved to be an importure. Though he may try as hard as he can to fly from the death which awaits him, yet his flight from such a mighty contest will be nothing less than death to him, and calamity will certainly overtake his Zion, for he must take the consequences of either the acceptance of the challenge or its refusal."

In view of the fact that Ahmad appears to have Dr. Dowie in a corner it may be possible that the latter will perfer to stay there rather than come out in the open and "leave the world with great sorrow and torment."—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*